DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 136 754 95 IR 004 489

AUTHOR	Sage, Mary
TITLE	Continuing Library Education: An Interdisciplinary Approach.
INSTITUTION	Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Dec 76
NOTE	197p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$10.03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Budgeting; *Communications; Consumer Protection; *Demonstration Projects; Interagency Cooperation; *Interdisciplinary Approach; *Library Education; Library Planning; Personnel Management; *Professional Continuing Education; Program Evaluation; Public Relations; Supervisory Training; Workshops

ABSTRACT

Six workshop modules were planned and conducted as a demonstration project for the development of an interdisciplinary continuing education program for librarians. Module subjects were: (1) communications techniques, (2) advertising and public relations, (3) personnel administration, (4) consumer protection information, (5) planning and budgeting, and (6) supervisory skills. These workshops were designed to provide factual information and practical experience through a variety of instructional formats, as well as to facilitate interlibrary and interagency communication. Appended are overviews of all six modules including course objectives, evaluation results, topics covered, resource materials, bibliographies, documents developed by instructors and participants, and samples of the instruments used to evaluate the workshops. (STS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED136754

IR004489

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Continuing Library Education:
an interdisciplinary approach

by

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Mary Sage

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

Mary Sage
Library Planner

A program conducted by the Librarians' Committee of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments through a grant from the United States Office of Education, Title IIB, Higher Education Act of 1965.

METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
Washington, D. C.

December, 1976

The activity which is the subject of this report was supported in whole or in part by the U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U. S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U. S. Office of Education should be inferred.

INTRODUCTION

The program described in this report was made possible through a grant from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Division of Libraries and Information Resources. Because it was a cooperative program we depended heavily on the interest and participation of a wide variety of people. The Librarians' Committee of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments initially developed the idea and members of that group continued to support the program by making time available for staff members to attend the various training sessions.

Paul Janaske, Chief of the Library Research and Demonstration Branch of the Office of Education, who monitored this project provided guidance throughout the development of the program and in the production of the final report. In addition our Advisory Committee composed of: Kay Ward, Fairfax County Public Schools; Margaret Thrasher, Prince George's County Memorial Library; Allen Knox, University of Illinois; Barbara Conroy, Tabernash, Colorado; Dr. Elizabeth Stone, Catholic University of America; Joe Lee, Martin Luther King Public Library; Tom Alrutz, Fairfax County Public Library System; and Joseph Jeffs, Georgetown University assisted in the needs assessment, the development of curricula and final evaluation. Thanks are also extended to Joyce Veenstra, who assisted in critiquing the final report.

COG staff provided valuable assistance in identifying instructors and helped in the development of the workshops involving personnel officers and consumer protection advocates. We are especially grateful to: Maureen Dursi, Training Assistant; Roy Wynn, Chief of Manpower and Employment Programs; Remington Aronoff, Human Resources Planner; and Ruth Crone, Director, Human Resources Department.

Finally the success of the program depended on the enthusiasm, imagination, dedication and unremitting effort of Mary Jones who responded good naturally to every request for technical assistance and Mary Sage who was responsible for the development and implementation of the workshops and who authored this report.

Marilyn Gell

Marilyn Gell
Chief of Library Programs

SUMMARY

The following text outlines the Council of Governments' twelve month demonstration project to develop a model interdisciplinary continuing education program for librarians. Funded by the Office of Libraries and Learning Resources of the U. S. Office of Education this project included the development and implementation of six courses for librarians in fields outside the traditional library education experience.

The primary goal of the program was to develop and evaluate a continuing education curriculum intended for library personnel and designed to encourage cooperation and communication among libraries and between librarians and those in other disciplines. While the transfer of specific information and skills in given subject areas was an important aspect of the workshop program, equally important was the goal of developing interlibrary and interagency communication.

Specific project objectives which supported the achievement of the goal were:

- To increase library effectiveness through improved staff competencies in specific subject area.
- To increase specific competencies of the librarians participating in the program.
- To examine a variety of methods in the delivery of continuing education activities.
- To ascertain the effectiveness of the Council of Governments as the sponsoring agency for continuing education activities.
- To produce and disseminate findings and recommendations from the project for its possible replication.

The six workshop modules that were developed covered the following subjects:

Communications Techniques
Advertising and Public Relations
Personnel Administration
Consumer Protection Information
Planning and Budgeting
Supervisory Skills

Evaluation results indicated that the program was successful in achieving its goal of increasing cooperation and communication within the library community and between the library community and other agencies. This was especially true in the areas of personnel administration and public relations.

The following are guidelines to be considered in developing an interdisciplinary program of this type:

- An indepth needs assessment should be conducted prior to program development.
- Liaisons should be established between project staff and library directors, the target community and participating outside agencies.
- If possible instructors should have experience in adult training as well as subject expertise.
- If communication and cooperation are intended program outcomes as much diversity as possible should be included in the participant group.
- Problem-solving courses should include some cognitive material.
- Courses should emphasize practical rather than theoretical material.
- The training coordinator should be an experienced professional librarian with some skill in educational programming.
- Some means for course follow-up should be established to monitor outcomes and develop cooperative programs.

The appendices which follow the body of this report provide summaries of the courses and include documents developed by participants and/or instructors.

Contents

1. MODEL PAGE

Background and Rationale for Project 1 - 3
Program Goal and Objectives 4 - 5
Program Planning 5 - 6
Resources and Facilities 6 - 9
Staffing and Administration 9 - 11
Selection of Workshop Topics 11 - 13
Target Groups 14
Publicity 14 - 16
Instructors 16 - 19
Course Planning and Implementation 19 - 24
Evaluation 24 - 28

2. WORKSHOPS

Communications Techniques 31 - 40
Advertising and Public Relations 41 - 49
Personnel Administration 50 - 58
Consumer Protection Information 59 - 66
Planning and Budgeting 67 - 73
Supervisory Skills 74 - 83

3. EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Project Evaluation 87 - 90
Guidelines for Implementation 90 - 104
Conclusion 105 - 106

4. APPENDICES

Communications Techniques 109 - 112
Advertising and Public Relations 113 - 121
Personnel Administration 122 - 133
Consumer Protection Information 134 - 145
Planning and Budgeting 146 - 168
Supervisory Skills 169 - 174
Evaluation Forms 175 - 190

Model

1

Background and Rationale for the Project

For some time the library profession has felt a demonstrable need to include information from other disciplines in continuing education programs. This concept has been described most recently and completely in the report on Continuing Library and Information Science Education produced in May, 1974 for the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

That study, directed by Dr. Elizabeth Stone reviewed and amplified the concept that "if library and information science personnel are to help solve the problems of the city, of the environment, of social work, and of education, they will need to find ways to develop 'interprofessional teams managed by competent project managers who can weld the various talents of the different professions together into a team effort.' (Schein, 1973)"[1]

In 1967 a questionnaire sent to library administrators in preparation for a workshop on continuing education in library administration held at Rutgers identified the same need and resulted in the suggestion that librarians should: "Participate in continuing education for library administrators by bringing in those skills which library administrators have indicated they need to have in order to improve their ideas and skills in administration and management, e.g., personnel administration, government and legislation, public relations, systems analysis. The library profession alone will not be able to provide these skills."

---

[1] Stone, E. W., Patrick, R. J. and Conroy, B. Continuing Library and Information Science Education; Final Report to the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. Washington, G. P. O., May 1974.

The overriding concern of the workshop participants was summed up in the published proceedings: "There appears to be a growing recognition, albeit largely verbal, that the library profession must generally seek the aid of other disciplines."[2]

Larry Bone and Frederic Hartz carried this concept further in an article appearing in the October 1, 1970 Library Journal. In a general discussion of continuing education they clearly suggest that "librarians can benefit from an understanding of such varied fields as urban sociology, city planning, demography and municipal government."[3]

Even more recently the need to include not only librarians, educators and publishers in the process of library planning, but planners and economists as well was stressed by Robert Vosper at the November, 1974 meeting of the International Federation of Library Associations. "In this educational effort," said Vosper, "we should adopt and profit from newer skills in the engineering, management and public administration professions."

---

[2] Harlow, Neal, Beasley, K. E., DeProspo, E. R. Jr., et al Administration and Change: Continuing Education in Library Administration. Rutgers University Press, 1969.

[3] Bone, L. E. and Hartz, F. R. "Taking the Full Ride: A Librarian's Route to Continuing Education," Library Journal, 95:3244-6, Oct. 1, 1970.

Clearly there is a recognized need for librarians to involve themselves very specifically in a variety of disciplines. If libraries are indeed to remain an intergral part of a complex and changing society, this approach is more than desirable, it is compulsory.

In response to this concern the Librarians' Committee of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (COG) submitted to the U. S. Office of Education a proposal to develop a model interdisciplinary continuing education program for librarians. The intent of this proposal was to develop a curriculum which would increase the effectiveness of participating libraries by acquainting staff members with applied and basic components of a variety of disciplines.

The program which resulted from the funding of this proposal was developed to serve as a model for other library cooperatives, associations, or systems interested in conducting similar interdisciplinary continuing education projects. A variety of subject areas were presented, some in experimental and some in traditional educational modes. This report is a detailed account of the planning, implementation, and evaluation of that program, with guidelines for implementation and recommendations for improvement.

Program Goal and Objectives

The primary goal of the program was to develop and evaluate a continuing education curriculum intended for library personnel and designed to encourage cooperation and communication among libraries and between librarians and those in other disciplines. While the transfer of specific information and skills in given subject areas was an important aspect of the workshop program, equally important was the goal of developing interlibrary and interagency communication.

Specific project objectives which supported the achievement of the goal were:

- To increase library effectiveness through improved staff competencies in specific subject areas.
- To increase specific competencies of the librarians participating in the program.
- To examine a variety of methods in the delivery of continuing education activities.
- To ascertain the effectiveness of the Council of Governments as the sponsoring agency for continuing education activities.
- To produce and disseminate findings and recommendations from the project for its possible replication.

These objectives provided guidelines for both the planning and evaluation of the project. They were instrumental in determining priorities in content, participant makeup, and instructional mode. Training objectives for each workshop were congruent with the overall project objectives and degrees of success were measured against both sets of criteria. The objectives and the rationale for selection were presented to the participants of each workshop so that they would fully understand what the program sought to accomplish. A vital step in any educational effort, this is especially important in an experimental program where failure to successfully communicate objectives can result in a high degree of frustration and confusion on the part of participants.

In the context of this program the interdisciplinary approach to library education meant providing librarians with instruction in areas outside the library field, those not included in traditonal library education curricula. In some instances this also meant bringing in participants from other agencies to interact with librarians to provide a forum for the exchange of ideas and perspectives and to develop cooperative methods of problem resolution. The interdisciplinary concept was also extended to include different segments of the library community; that is, participants were to be drawn from different types of libraries and jurisdictions to interact in the workshops.

Program Planning

The planning phase of the project took place in the three month period between August and November, 1975. Because the program involved the cooperation of a number of agencies and organizations and because this was the first continuing education effort by the Librarians' Committee, considerable time was devoted to the initial stages of program development. During this period a training coordinator was hired to develop and implement the program and background research was conducted in the areas of adult learning, interdisciplinary education, and in-service library training. Contact was initiated between the project staff and various COG committees and departments to identify resources and establish communication channels. The project Advisory Committee was appointed and its first meeting held to define objectives and develop evaluation procedures. Finally the curriculum of six workshops was established and publicity and evaluation instruments were developed.

Resources and Facilities

The Washington metropolitan area offered an ideal setting for the development of a program of this nature. The area itself encompasses approximately three million people in city, suburban, and relatively rural environments within a geographic area of 2,980 square miles. Libraries reflect both the concentration and diversity of the community, with 1/6 of the total library resources in the country to be found in over 1,000 library and reference facilities in the area. In addition the vast number of universities, governmental agencies, special interest and consulting groups, and private researchers located in the area provide a wealth of experts from which to recruit instructors for a diversified educational program.

The Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments is the regional organization of the area's 16 local governments and their governing officials. It was formed as a result of the need to develop a region-wide consensus to promote coordinated cooperative action among the independent jurisdictions regarding those problems which cannot be solved by any single government.

The Librarians' Committee is composed of the library directors of each of the public libraries in this metropolitan area and representatives of Federal, State, special, university and school libraries as well. The committee was formed to advise and support COG in its objective of attaining optimum levels of library service and to develop cooperative programs which would promote the effective use of the library by and to the public and to support the activities of the library community itself.

In the development of this program the affiliation of the Librarians' Committee with the Council of Governments provided a unique opportunity to draw from a rich pool of resources and support services and facilitated interaction and cooperation between libraries and other agencies. Technical assistance in conference and workshop planning was provided by the staff of COG's Metropolitan Training Institute, an in-house training department with extensive experience in adult education. The Institute staff and other departments of the Council of Governments were also consulted regarding recommended speakers and instructional content. This contact proved to be a valuable asset for the program as it facilitated contact with outside resource persons and enabled the project staff to identify important subtopics in relevant fields outside the traditional library experience.

The project staff also met and consulted with members of selected COG committees, i.e., the Consumer Protection Committee and the Personnel Officers Committee. This contact was advantageous for several reasons. It alerted department heads in other agencies to the upcoming workshops, identified areas where cooperation was needed, and established an interest which facilitated recruitment of participants. In addition, soliciting the cooperation and support of agency heads prior to the courses facilitated the implementation of long range strategies and recommendations developed by participants.

The workshops were held at the Council of Governments' offices in midtown Washington to provide a central location convenient to participants and instructors from the various suburban jurisdictions as well as the central city. COG support facilities included a conference room where the courses were held, audiovisual equipment, copying facilities and secretarial support for instructors. By conducting the workshops in-house the staff was able to perform administrative functions smoothly and instructors were able to make last minute program modifications that required additional equipment or clerical assistance.

Staffing and Administration

The program was developed under the direction of the Chief of Library Programs for the Council of Governments, who conceived the project and developed the original proposal. The project was staffed by a library planner who was hired to serve as full-time training coordinator. Clerical support was provided by the COG secretarial staff.

The project staff met frequently to discuss program development and formulate strategies for achieving objectives. The project director served as the principal consultant, guiding the direction of the program and helping maintain the original intent of the proposal. The training coordinator was responsible for developing and implementing the program, including designing the training modules, contacting instructors, recruiting participants, budgeting funds, and designing and implementing evaluation instruments.

Valuable assistance in program development was provided by the project Advisory Committee. The membership of the Committee was chosen to reflect a broad range of professional interest and expertise. Those with experience in educational programming aided in developing program objectives and evaluation criteria and provided liaison with the library education community. Representatives from local library systems were able to advise the project staff about local training priorities, participant reactions and potential logistical constraints. Unfortunately, these representatives were from school and public libraries only, and the committee was not able to reflect the interests of academic and special librarians. As one of the primary program objectives was to promote interaction by type of library, this was a decided disadvantage. Input from a representative of the special library community would have been especially helpful in developing an effective method of distributing publicity to this group.

Three meetings of the Advisory Committee were held. The first considered planning and evaluation of the workshops, concentrating on refining objectives and developing criteria for evaluation. The second meeting was held mid-way through the year to discuss the progress of the project, identify potential problem areas and suggest modifications. The purpose of the final meeting was to elicit informal feedback from participants through Advisory Committee members, identify strengths and weaknesses of the project as a whole and the individual workshop components, and develop strategies for future continuing education efforts by the Librarians' Committee. The fact that two of the educational consultants were from outside the Washington area was another disadvantage. While their help proved invaluable in refining the program during the initial stages, as the program developed distance and infrequent communication made it difficult for them to continue active participation.

The project staff maintained close contact with library administrators through the Librarians' Committee. Progress reports were delivered to directors at their bimonthly meetings, where program modifications were considered and recommendations from the workshops were presented for discussion and possible action.

This contact with the Librarians' Committee and the Advisory Committee provided the project staff with input from a number of different perspectives and contributed to the flexibility and responsiveness of the program. Technical advice was utilized to refine methodology and reliable feedback mechanisms were established for assessing program development.

Selection of Workshop Topics

The list of possible workshop topics was developed on the basis of input from a variety of sources: Interviews with people outside the library field who are concerned with what is happening in libraries, (e.g., personnel specialists, budgeting officers, consumer information specialists) reports in the professional literature, local library directors and key administrators, and potential participants.

A preliminary survey was conducted to determine what types of continuing education were already available and what training policies were being employed. In addition a needs assessment procedure involving 50 Washington area librarians at various professional levels and in different types of libraries was conducted by telephone to determine what topics, in keeping with the interdisciplinary nature of the project, were of high priority interest to them. The needs assessment not only identified broad areas of interest but also indicated those subtopics with which the workshops might deal directly and established an interest on the part of the target community. An additional benefit of this direct contact was in providing the project staff with a functional vocabulary with which to attract participants.

From the list generated by the needs assessment the final topic selection was made on the basis of the following criteria: (1) The topic needed to be one that could be dealt with effectively in an educational program, (2) One that was best dealt with by COG in contrast to a library school or association, and (3) One that lent itself well to bringing in resource persons and/or participants from other occupations.

The selected topics are listed below:

- Communications Techniques
- Advertising and Public Relations
- Personnel Administration
- Consumer Protection Information
- Planning and Budgeting
- Supervisory Skills

All were topics about which sufficient bodies of formalized knowledge existed for them to be dealt with in an educational program, all lent themselves well to bringing in resource persons from outside the library field, and in all cases qualified resource persons were available. These were also topics which could be used to promote cooperation and communication, and it was anticipated that COG sponsorship would facilitate that interaction. In addition, courses in some of these areas had previously been conducted for local government officials by the Metropolitan Training Institute. Thus selection of instructors and course content could be based to some extent on evaluation data from those workshops.

Target Groups

Interaction and cooperation were primary objectives of the workshop program. Participants were selected to facilitate interaction by disciplines, jurisdictions, professional levels and types of libraries. Some of the workshops were designed to reach librarians with specialized responsibilities while other were aimed at a cross section of professionals within the library community. In all cases an attempt was made to incorporate as much diversity as possible into the participant groups.

In some instances professionals from disciplines outside the library field whose job responsibilities related to workshop topics were invited to attend the workshops as participants. Initial contact with outside agencies was made through appropriate committees at COG (e.g., Personnel Officers Committee, Consumer Protection Committee). This contact with agency heads provided input as to the feasibility of cooperative efforts with libraries, fostered interest in sending staff members as participants, and facilitated subsequent implementation of recommendations that came out of the workshops.

Publicity

Program announcements were distributed for each workshop. Each brochure contained background information about the total project, a description of the course, including mode, content, agenda, names of instructors, target groups, and a detachable self-mailing registration form. Additonal information included access to public transportation, parking facilities, a map indicating the location of the COG offices, and the name of someone to contact for further information.

Distribution of publicity was primarily accomplished through established library channels, that is, by bulk mailing of brochures to the offices of library directors. This not only alerted the directors to the workshop at an early stage, but allowed them to participate in the selection process by suggesting personnel who would benefit most from workshop attendance. Unfortunately this method was sometimes slow and to some degree ineffective. Further dissemination was often delayed two to three weeks, and in some cases announcements never reached individual branches or media centers. While admittedly more expensive and time consuming, direct mail to media centers and public and academic branch libraries as well as to library directors would have facilitated broader dissemination of program information.

In some cases courses were also publicized in library association newsletters and COG publications, although few participants indicated that they had found out about the workshops through these means. The last workshop in the series, Supervisory Skills, was publicized by distribution through the membership list of one of the library associations as well as the above-mentioned channels. This was intended to attract those people who might not be reached through normal organizational channels, thus promoting interaction among a greater diversity of libraries and librarians. This was an attempt to determine the degree to which direct mail expanded the pool of potential participants. The high response rate to the workshop would seem to verify that this did expand the pool although the diversity and quantity of applicants could also in part be attributable to the broad applicability of the subject and the expressed need for training in this area. It should be noted that too much success in recruiting participants can have a negative impact. In this case the limited enrollment precluded accepting over half of the applicants and resulted in some degree of frustration on the part of those who could not be accepted.

Publicity for workshops involving participants from outside the library field, e.g., Personnel Administration and Consumer Protection, was distributed through appropriate COG committees and generally resulted in a higher degree of representation from outside agencies than had been anticipated.

Instructors

The affiliation of the program with a broadly based, diversified agency such as the Council of Governments was a valuable asset in the recruitment of instructors as it provided access to professionals with expertise in a wide variety of disciplines. The staff of the Metropolitan Training Institute was able to recommend instructors who had participated in previous training courses and while these people were not always able to participate in the program, they were often able to refer the project staff to other resource persons in the area.

Other departments of the Council of Governments, including Personnel, Public Relations and Planning Coordination, were also valuable resources for contacting potential instructors in both the public and private sectors. In addition contacts were established with the regional network of training personnel, private consultants and subject experts. These contacts were not only valuable in this program but will also be an asset in the development of future continuing education efforts.

The training staff was generally selected on the basis of several criteria: expertise in the subject area, recommendations from other professionals, cost, and adult teaching experience. While subject expertise was, of course, an important prerequisite, in many cases the most effective criteria proved to be experience and skill in teaching adult learners, especially in working with professionals in a variety of disciplines. Those instructors with this background were generally more adaptable and responsive to the needs of participants and received higher evaluation scores than those who delivered presentations based solely on their professional experience. While this is no doubt true of any educational effort, the interdisciplinary nature of this program placed even more emphasis on the ability of instructors to relate to participants and adapt instructional content to their needs. Similarly evaluation data from previous workshops proved to be a more reliable selection tool than recommendations from other professionals.

Although familiarity with the library field was not generally an important consideration, all other factors being equal, those who had some knowledge of the field were selected by the staff over those who did not. The response to these instructors was generally favorable although the familiarity with libraries proved not so valuable in improving content as in facilitating the development of rapport between instructors and participants.

In all of the courses instruction was provided by a variety of speakers, either acting in teams, serving on panels, or making individual presentations. In most cases this was beneficial as it provided participants with exposure to a variety of backgrounds, viewpoints and personalities, and, in intensive courses such as these, it alleviated the tedium of watching one person lecture for two or three days. It also facilitated the procurement of highly qualified instructors. Many representatives of local or federal agencies were unable to devote more than a few hours, at the most a day, to course participation, while many private consultants were unwilling or unable to make prolonged presentations without substantially increasing their fees.

The diversity of instructors, of course, had some drawbacks. The potential for duplication or omission of course subtopics was increased, making it more difficult to insure continuity. It also meant that each instructor had to devote some time to becoming familiar with participants, establishing rapport and developing mutual trust and group identity. In this type of program, involving a variety of instructors from a number of disciplines, the role of the program coordinator thus became more strategic as it became her responsibility to identify potential problem areas, coordinate instructors and course content and provide a link between instructors and participants.

Course Planning and Implementation

The model program consisted of six two to three-day workshops held over a period of seven months. The workshops were designed to provide participants with factual information and practical experience through a variety of formats including formal lecture, panel discussion, case study analysis, participatory planning, and small and full group exercises.

The course planning was done by the training coordinator with the advice of the project director. Each course required from 10 to 15 days of the training coordinator's time to develop and implement. Initial course planning usually began at least two months before the workshop was to take place. At this stage instructors were contacted, dates finalized, room arrangements made, publicity developed and appropriate committees notified. Publicity was then distributed five to six weeks before the workshop with a registration deadline of two weeks before the first day of the course. At least this much lead time was necessary to allow applicants to apply for leave and administrators to make scheduling arrangements.

Immediately following the deadline registrants were selected and notified. Contingent upon workshop objectives selection was based upon the applicant's position, the type of library in which he or she worked, the number of applicants from his or her institution and the date of receipt of the application. A more precise selection would have been possible had participants been requested to submit with their applications profiles indicating job responsibilities, past experience and/or training, and what they hoped to gain from the course.

In the two weeks prior to the workshop the training coordinator worked closely with participants and instructors to coordinate and modify the program. Participants were first surveyed to determine specific expectations and needs. This was accomplished through the use of telephone interviews and written forms. During the interviews participants were asked about specific problems they hoped to solve, the level of instruction they felt they needed and subtopics they wanted to see addressed. At this time, the evaluation procedures were outlined and the names of participants' supervisors obtained for the pre-course survey.

Interviewing by telephone, while time-consuming and sometimes frustrating, proved to be a valuable procedure. It forced participants to think through and verbalize their own goals and resulted in more specific input than did the written forms. In addition it gave the project coordinator an opportunity to respond to questions participants may have had regarding the mode or content of the workshop. In a few cases this resulted in the withdrawal of applications when it was determined that the objectives of the workshops were not compatible with the applicants' needs or expectations. This was especially important with those courses employing experimental or non-traditional educational modes. In one instance, the Consumer Protection Workshop, where lack of time precluded conducting the survey, failure to understand the instructional mode that was to be employed contributed to the high degree of frustration and confusion expressed by participants.

A less tangible, though no less important, benefit derived from this pre-course contact was the rapport that was initiated between participants and the project staff. Many participants voiced appreciation at being consulted personally about the workshop and being given an opportunity to ask questions about the course content and logistical considerations such as luncheon arrangements and car pooling opportunities.

Whenever possible the project coordinator met with instructors prior to the workshops. In instances where the lecture material or planned exercises of instructors appeared similar enough to indicate the possible duplication or omission of certain subtopics, a group meeting of all instructors was arranged to coordinate the presentations. At these plenary meetings participant expectations were fed back to instructors so that feasible last minute program modifications could be made. Efforts were made to address as many specific participant needs as possible. This is a vital step in an interdisciplinary program as the instructors will generally know little or nothing about librarianship. Efforts should be made to acquaint the instructor with specific problems the participants face in their jobs. The role of the program coordinator is crucial here as it is his or her responsibility to mesh instructional content with participant needs and program objectives.

One procedure which was not employed but which would no doubt have added to the value of the program would have been to provide instructors with relevant articles from the professional literature prior to the workshops, thus enabling them to better relate their presentations to the library environment. It is also recommended that, if possible, instructors be paid additional fees for preparation time. This time could be used to do independent research and content adaptation, avoiding "canned" presentations and making it easier for participants to relate the course to their own work situations.

The workshops, 2 - 3 days in length and generally limited to 25 participants, were held on consecutive days to provide continuity to the presentations and intensify the learning experience. Each participant received an information packet which included a detailed agenda, course objectives, a list of participants and instructors, a bibliography, and supplementary instructional materials.

The program coordinator attended all of the workshop sessions to handle administrative functions and act as an observer. Periodically throughout each day the coordinator surveyed participants informally to elicit feedback and met with the instructors to suggest modifications. Again an interdisciplinary program necessitated this liaison to insure that the instructional content was appropriate. The instructor had to be responsive at all times to the needs of the group and willing to make feasible changes when necessary. At the end of each course, participants were told that they could contact instructors if they wished to replicate the workshop in their home institutions and that the training coordinator would provide technical assistance in workshop planning and in locating potential instructors and sources of supplementary materials.

Participants were encouraged both by library administrators and the project staff to disseminate information to other staff members at their home institutions. Dissemination was generally accomplished through written or oral reports, informal discussion or in-house mini-workshops. In several cases the project staff was able to provide technical assistance and recommend instructors for these in-house programs.

Evaluation

With the assistance of the project Advisory Committee a method of evaluation was developed which included data collection from participants, instructors, and supervisors of participants. Samples of the evaluation instruments that were developed are appended (Appendix G). The training coordinator also attended all workshop sessions and prepared a summary report for each course based on observations and informal participant comments. The evaluation strategy was developed to provide information which could be used to modify the program, assess its impact and establish guidelines for future continuing education efforts by the Librarians' Committee.

In addition to the expectations forms submitted before the courses a written survey of student opinion was undertaken at the conclusion of each course. Participants were asked to evaluate the course in terms of:

- Overall content and format and extent to which the program met expectations and achieved objectives.
- Instructors' content, delivery and interaction with the group.
- Extent to which greater knowledge and skills pertaining to the course subject had been gained and were applicable to present duties.

Two months after each course follow-up questionnaires were distributed to participants to determine:

- Which parts of the course had proven the most useful.
- Ways in which course participation had affected them and their institutions.
- Interest in attending future continuing education courses sponsored by the Council of Governments.

Summaries of participant responses are presented with each unit report and are used as the basis for determining the major strengths and weaknesses of the courses. While the response rate to follow-up questionnaires was generally 50% or less this data does provide a source of information for determining program impact and is submitted with an appreciation of the inherent limitations. This information was supplemented by a telephone sampling of participants not returning follow-up evaluations. No significant difference in attitude was discerned from those who did. The most common reason for failure to respond was resentment at the amount of paperwork generated by the evaluation process.

An evaluation instrument was also developed to survey the reactions of instructors to the courses. Each was asked to evaluate:

- The applicability of the specific topic to the field of library science.
- Responsiveness of the students.
- Extent to which knowledge and understanding of libraries had been increased.

Instructors were also asked to suggest improvements for planning future courses; these suggestions were considered in determining program modifications.

Pre- and post-course questionnaires were also distributed to supervisors of participants. It was originally intended that this would identify institutional objectives in sending participants to the courses, determine whether those objectives had been met, and give an alternative appraisal of participant behavior. This proved to be an ineffective mechanism, however, as few of the supervisors responded to the questionnaires. In fact, resentment was generated on the part of some supervisors, who, throughout the course of the program, were asked to evaluate a number of participants and felt that this was an imposition on their time which resulted in little return for their efforts. The low response rate of supervisors again obviates drawing general conclusions based on their input; however, responses relating to specific outcomes and/or effects on participating libraries or agencies are included.

Valuable information was also obtained from Advisory Committee members representing local library systems at their final meeting. Committee members informally surveyed participants to determine their reactions. This mechanism resulted in feedback which was a valuable supplement to that obtained through the written comments and will serve as an information resource for future continuing education projects.

For courses where significant cooperative actions grew out of the workshops a section marked Outcomes has been added to the course descriptions. Cooperative actions varied greatly depending on the subject and emphasis of the course. In many cases the outcomes were greater than had been expected due to the intervention of the Librarians' Committee. This contact provided a viable mechanism for implementation of workshop recommendations. In many cases documents relating to workshop topics were produced either by participants or instructors. These documents have been appended along with outlines of each workshop.

In general, this model was designed for two basic purposes: (1) To provide librarians with exposure to information from relevant fields outside the traditional library education experience, and (2) To encourage cooperation and communication among librarians and between librarians and other professionals. All aspects of the program reflected these priorities. The following sections outline the advantages and disadvantages of this approach. As is generally the case, factors that were strengths in some settings often proved to be weaknesses in others. Detailed descriptions are given of the planning, implementation and evaluation of each of the workshop modules. Detailed accounts of actual lectures and exercises have not been included as it is anticipated that in replicating the workshops actual content will be determined by the needs of different sets of instructors and participants. Instead emphasis is placed on the processes involved in developing and implementing the courses, what was effective and what was not, and general guidelines which may be used as a structure upon which to build similar programs.

Workshops

2

COMMUNICATIONS TECHNIQUES - November 4-5-6

Basic to all institutional problems is the need for effective communication. In a library setting this need becomes apparent not only when staff members try to communicate with one another but also when a librarian attempts to transmit needed information to a client. This workshop was developed in response to the need of librarians for exposure to the theories of communication and practice in developing skills essential to the accurate and effective transmission of information.

It was anticipated that this topic would attract librarians from many different types of organizations and provide a forum for the exchange of ideas, problems and perspectives among a variety of librarians, thus supporting achievement of the program goal promoting communication among librarians. It is also an area of instruction that has only recently been introduced into the curricula of library schools, and while those new to the profession may have had exposure to communications theories, many mid-career professionals have not. These expectations would appear to be born out by the makeup of those registering for the course, although some of the participants had had some post-graduate school training in the field.

Another equally important rationale for selecting this topic had to do with the ease with which the workshop could be conducted. A workshop on this topic had previously been conducted by the Metropolitan Training Institute, making reliable instructors easily obtainable and facilitating preliminary course development. This being the first course in the series and the first offered by the Librarians' Committee it was necessary to establish COG's credibility in continuing education and develop an interest on the part of the library community. Comments made informally and on evaluation forms indicate that the course was successful in this regard.

Course Goal and Objectives

The stated goal of the workshop was to introduce participants to information and techniques which would enable them to communicate more effectively in their personal and professional lives. Specific course objectives included:

1. To increase library effectiveness through improved knowledge of communications techniques by participanting staff members.
2. To increase individual competencies in specific areas of communication:
    a. Interpersonal communication
    b. Non-verbal communication
    c. Use of language in communication
    d. Written communication
    e. Oral presentations
3. To disseminate information through participants to other library staff members (informal communication, workshop replication, etc.).
4. To promote interaction among librarians.

Recruitment and Selection of Participants

One month before the course, brochures were distributed to school, public, academic and special libraries throughout the region. Announcements were also placed in local library association newsletters and COG pulications. Sixteen applicants registered for the course, thirteen of whom ultimately attended classes. All who applied were accepted to the course.

It was anticipated that the broad dissemination of publicity and general applicability of the subject would result in a high rate of response. While it is difficult to determine exactly why this expectation was not realised possible causes may have been related to the late mailing of publicity brochures, the existence of in-house training programs on this topic in many libraries and, as previously mentioned, the need for the Librarians' Committee to establish its credibility in continuing education. In addition the non-specific nature of the course may have deterred participants desirous of obtaining more practical skills. Participants in all the workshops indicated a preference for specific and practical material.

Instructors

Two private consultants and a university professor were hired to act as instructors for the course. All had had formal training in the subject areas they were to address and two had extensive experience in adult education. The third was an experienced teacher but had had limited experience in teaching adults.

Course Content and Mode

The course was conducted in the traditional workshop mode, involving formal lecture, participatory exercises, and informal discussion. The desire for an immediate success to establish credibility precluded employing a more experimental approach in the first workshop.

Instructional material for the course included an introduction to theories of listening, verbal and non-verbal communication and written expression. Formal lecture was used to communicate theoretical concepts and provide a basis for group activities and informal discussion. Full and small group exercises, audiovisuals, and individual problem solving were used to stimulate group interaction and reinforce concepts. Informal group discussion involving specific problems was incorporated into each day's agenda to facilitate practical application of cognitive material.

Evaluation

Based on the observations of the project staff and the written comments of participants and instructors, the course was successful in achieving its overall goal of introducing participants to communications techniques and theories which would help them in their personal and professional lives. All of the participants stated that they had been provided with concrete skills which could be applied to their present jobs. The most commonly cited areas of improvement were listening skills and memo and announcement preparation. All but one indicated that the course had met or exceeded their expectations.

Of the seven completing follow-up questionnaires, six felt that the course goal had been achieved while one indicated that it had not. Those who rated the course positively indicated good leadership, group participation and exposure to new ideas as major contributing factors. The individual who indicated a negative response cited "failure to deal with communications problems in libraries" as the cause. The latter was a response that appeared periodically throughout the program and in some cases it was a major inhibiting factor. In this case, however, the favorable response by other participants, would seem to indicate that with this particular topic knowledge of the library field by instructors is not essential. In fact, of the three participants who had attended similar workshops given by librarians, two rated this course as more effective indicating that the speakers were more knowledgeable about and at ease with their subjects and that the information presented was more practical. The third participant felt the workshop to be less effective but indicated that it was a valuable supplement.

While some had reservations about the level of the material presented, in terms of the topics covered the content of the course met with the approval of almost all of the participants. Many of the participants indicated that non-verbal communication and body language were covered insufficiently and would have preferred a full day devoted to these topics. None of the participants felt that any of the topics covered was unnecessary, and one participant indicated that group dynamics would have been a valuable addition.

The fourth course objective, that of disseminating information through participants to other library staff members appears to have been realized. All of the participants completing follow-up evaluations indicated that they had formally or informally disseminated course information. It is difficult to determine what specific effect this may have had on participating libraries, however, given the subjective nature of the course topics.

While a high degree of interaction was achieved in the workshop itself, none of the participants indicated that they had had subsequent contact with other librarians as a result of the course. Given the personal orientation of the course, however, it was not anticipated that subsequent interaction would take place.

All of the course instructors commented favorably on the enthusiasm and responsiveness of the group and felt the participants had made excellent application of theory to their immediate problems. Two of the three suggested that they would have preferred to have had more input from the participants before the course to help them in designing their presentations. All felt that the topics were applicable to the field of library science.

Strengths

The informal, participatory mode of the workshop was considered one of its major strengths. A great deal of interaction was stimulated by the use of participatory exercises and practical approaches to problem resolution. The instructors allowed time in their lesson plans for informal communication to take place between participants and for participants to present individual problems to the group for discussion. In this way participants developed a feeling of group identity and concern and were presented with real, library-oriented problems to solve. In an interdisciplinary program this can be valuable, as abstract problems or case studies brought in by instructors often lack specific library application and require participants to adapt the information to their own situations. The size of the class also contributed to the relaxed atmosphere and participants seemed to be somewhat less inhibited than they might have been in a larger group.

Another major strength was the diversity of librarians involved in the course. Several participants noted that they appreciated the opportunity to meet and talk with other types of librarians. In addition, the opportunity to hear problems discussed and strategies developed in other types of institutions allowed them exposure to a variety of alternative viewpoints. This mix by type of library is a characteristic that can be very beneficial in a course such as this where the skills to be learned are of a personal nature and thereby not wholly defined by the peculiarities of one type of library.

The diversity and capability of the instructors was generally regarded as a strength. Most students felt that they benefited from the exposure to a variety of viewpoints and personalities. In an informal, participatory mode such as the one employed here, the ability of the instructor to both lead the group and be responsive to its needs is a crucial factor. Those instructors with extensive experience in adult learning appeared to be more able to provide this type of leadership and received more positive ratings from the participants. In addition, having had experience in dealing with a variety of professional groups they were better able to relate specific library problems to the instructional material.

The variety of subtopics was felt by many to be a strength. While this meant that some topics were dealt with in a somewhat cursory fashion it also allowed participants to apply theories and techniques relating to one type of communication to another and develop an integrated overview of themselves as communicators.

Weaknesses

Perhaps the major weakness of the course was the lack of coordination between course components. This resulted in some degree of repetition and insufficient coverage of one of the topics. While instructors submitted detailed agendas prior to the course and were informed of the potential for discontinuity, a formal meeting giving instructors the opportunity to discuss their presentations and assume responsibility for specific areas could have averted this problem. This led to setting up pre-course meetings between the instructors and the training coordinator for future courses. This was a critical step in courses where the subtopics were integrally related. In subsequent workshops where plenary meetings were held this problem did not recur.

Another weakness was the failure to specifically identify the target group for the course. The course was designed for those with little or no formal introduction to communication theories. As this was not made clear on the initial publicity some participants were hoping for exposure to more sophisticated material. A more detailed description of the intended target group in the initial publicity would have resulted in a more accurate match of participant needs with course content, and a pre-course survey of expectations, as was employed in subsequent workshops, would have served to further screen the applicants.

ADVERTISING AND PUBLIC RELATIONS - December 1, 2, 4

Librarians have long felt the need to enhance the library image through imaginative publicity and more effective community and client relations. In many cases librarians find themselves with responsibility for developing media contacts, writing press releases, and producing publicity with little or no formal training in these areas. This course was designed to introduce useful public relations techniques and encourage the development of new, creative approaches.

Again it was felt that this topic would attract librarians from different types of organizations and it was anticipated that the exchange of ideas from a number of perspectives would be beneficial to participants. To some degree this proved to be true although the preponderance of public librarians tended to divert the emphasis away from the needs of the few school and academic librarians present.

Another reason for selecting this topic was the potential for cooperative action in the areas of advertising and public relations. As will be indicated, cooperative action was realized to an even greater degree than had been anticipated, largely as a result of access to library administrators through the Librarians' Committee.

Course Goal and Objectives

The goal of the workshop was to introduce participants to effective ways of dealing with advertising and public relations in libraries. Objectives which supported the achievement of that goal were:

1. To increase library effectiveness through improved knowledge of advertising and public relations by participating staff members.
2. To increase individual competencies in specific areas of advertising and public relations:
    a. The basic theories of public relations
    b. Use of public information in program development
    c. Visual and graphic communications
    d. Use of the media in public relations
3. To disseminate information through participants to other library staff members (informal communication, workshop replication, etc.)
4. To promote interaction among librarians and between librarians and other professionals.

Recruitment and Selection of Participants

Program announcements were distributed six weeks before the course, primarily to public and academic libraries. Library systems were encouraged to send teams of two participants, one each from the administrative and professional levels (e.g., a public services librarian and a branch librarian). It was hoped that this approach would facilitate on-the-job application of the skills and techniques presented at the workshop. It was anticipated that core groups made up of representatives from various levels within a single library would be formed which would be committed to implementing suggestions coming out of the workshop. Several factors inhibited the achievement of this goal which are addressed in the evaluation section of this chapter.

In all, thirty-one applications were received and from these twenty-six applicants were selected on the basis of institutional, (i.e. team) affiliation, job responsibility and receipt of application. Twenty-three librarians ultimately completed the course.

Instructors

Instruction was provided by two professors who teach public relations on the college level, a representative from the Government Printing Office, and a private design consultant. The design consultant had previously worked with librarians as a group and participants expressed appreciation at having an instructor with some prior exposure to libraries. While this may not necessarily be a prerequisite in an interdisciplinary program, in this experience those instructors with some special knowledge of libraries were generally well received by participants.

Course Content and Mode

The course was conducted using formal lecture, participatory exercises and audiovisuals to convey theories and provide practical experience.

Participants were presented with material relating to the theory and application of public relations skills.

Theoretical material included discussions of the basic rules of public relations, the role of opinion molders, and the function of public information in program planning. On a more practical level participants were given tips on writing press releases, making contact with the print and broadcast media, working with civic clubs and schools, and developing long and short range promotional efforts.

In the component on graphic design participants viewed a slide presentation on visual communications in libraries. The design consultant then critiqued materials brought in by participants from their own libraries. Based on questions and suggestions from participants at the workshop, the design consultant developed an outline of basic strategies for improving graphic communications in libraries which was distributed to participants subsequent to the workshop. Many participants felt that this was a valuable addition to the classroom materials, and it appeared to go a long way toward bridging the gap that can exist between instructors and participants who come from different professional backgrounds. That report is appended. (Appendix B)

Evaluation

Evaluation data from participants and outcomes resulting from the workshop indicate that this was an extremely successful course. Of the 17 participants completing end-of-course evaluation forms 15 indicated that the course had met or exceeded their expectations, citing intersystem interaction and the practicality of course content as contributing factors. The participants who indicated that their expectations had not been met were from an academic and a school library, and while some from outside the public library experience felt they benefited from the course, the overall response would seem to indicate that the mix by types of library was not effective in terms of the workshop goal.

Almost all of the participants indicated that they had achieved a greater understanding of the topics listed in the course objectives and 16 indicated that the information had been relevant to their occupational needs. Of the nine participants completing follow-up questionnaires seven indicated that the course goal had been achieved "very well" or "quite well," citing the calibre of the instructors, organization of the workshop, and its practical orientation as major contributing factors. The two who indicated that the goal had been achieved "somewhat" were again from other than public libraries and cited that as the cause.

Areas that were felt to be unnecessary included theories of public relations, mentioned by two participants, and ways to increase library usage. Areas that were covered insufficiently included public relations for school and academic libraries and elements of graphic design. Suggested additions to the course syllabus included specific ways of testing public relations use, improving internal public relations and ways of obtaining public relations funding.

Of the two who had attended public relations workshops given by librarians, both felt this to be more effective because of the presence of speakers with real knowledge and practice in the field and because of the presence of a library public relations officer as a participant who could effectively communicate to the instructors the public relations needs and problems unique to libraries.

Follow-up surveys indicated that all of the participants responding had in some way disseminated information from the workshop and that this had had an effect on their libraries. Generally, the result was an increased understanding of the need for public relations and an improved use of graphic communications.

Success in terms of increased interaction and communication is evident in the number of participants (15 out of 17) who indicated that they welcomed the opportunity to speak with librarians from other systems and felt that this was an important element of the workshop for them.

All of the instructors felt that the course subject matter was applicable to the library field and that the level of sophistication was appropriate. One indicated that there was too great a mix of participants, some with public relations background, some without, and that the course should have focused more specifically on one group. This observation does not seem to be borne out by participant evaluations, however, as only one participant indicated that the presentations had been too simple, and all of the participants indicated that they had been frequently or almost always informative. In future courses this outcome would no doubt be dependent upon the expertise of those involved, and if the team approach were not employed, focusing more specifically on a target group by degree of expertise would probably be a more dependable approach.

Most of the participants felt that the team approach had contributed very little to the realization of workshop goals. This failure can be attributed to several probable causes. Insufficient preparation of library administrators resulted in a low level of participation by those with sufficient power to implement changes; in addition, staffing and scheduling constraints made it difficult for libraries to send more than one participant from a branch. The resulting teams, therefore, were composed largely of participants with similar responsibilities from different branches. This made it difficult for them to get together after the workshop to develop a coordinated public relations campaign and did little to improve their access to the administrative power structure. It must also be remembered that the potential for conflict increases with the potential for change. In one instance where participants were able to develop plans for a systemwide public relations campaign this resulted in the early and somewhat painful resignation of the library public relations officer. The team approach therefore, is one that requires substantial pre- and post-course planning and monitoring, including contact with library directors and participants' supervisors.

Strengths

One of the major strengths of the program was the emphasis on practical approaches to improving public relations. Participants indicated that they appreciated the opportunity to learn "how-to" solutions to specific problems, noting that they found that this facilitated implementing change back at their home institutions and helped them in developing coordinated public relations campaigns. Simple, low-cost solutions were especially valuable given the paucity of time and money usually devoted to public relations efforts in libraries.

The calibre of the instructors was another major strength cited by participants. These were generally rated very highly in terms of content, delivery, and audience contact. The fact that in all cases their knowledge was rooted in front line experience, not just theoretical constructs, made them more responsive to the practical needs and constraints faced by the participants.

Weaknesses

As previously noted the major weakness of the course was the inclusion of librarians from academic and school libraries. It was originally felt that the theories and strategies would lend themselves to application among various types of libraries. The preponderance of public librarians present, however, focused the attention on public library needs to the exclusion of others. The easiest way to solve this problem would be to limit enrollment to public librarians only; this would allow instructors to focus their presentations more precisely, making the content more directly applicable to participant needs. If interaction by type of library is still a priority the workshop should be restructured to include concurrent small group presentations and exercises directed toward the needs of specific participant groups as well as full group sessions with informal discussion and group interaction.

Another weakness of the course was the failure to attract high level administrators as participants. Many participants expressed frustration at not having access to those with the power to implement needed changes. They felt that administrators would have benefited from a chance to hear their problems and concerns and work out cooperative solutions with the advice of professionals. This was, of course, the original intent of the team approach, but not enough preparation was devoted to laying the groundwork to insure that administrators would indeed participate. Access to administrators through the Librarians' Committee proved very valuable in this case and the appointment of the Public Relations Task Force, outlined below, did much to ultimately offset the frustrations of the participants.

Outcomes

At the end of the course a group discussion was conducted to develop strategies for cooperative public relations between libraries in the Washington area. Participant recommendations from the workshop were then presented before the Librarians' Committee. As a result, a Public Relations Task Force, comprised primarily of workshop participants, was appointed to develop and implement cooperative programs. The task force is currently studying the joint purchase of art supplies, selecting a universal library/information symbol for use in the Washington area, developing radio and television public service announcements and developing a mechanism for the systematic dissemination of public information among area libraries. Future objectives include increasing and improving media exposure, improving communications between libraries and other agencies and developing strategies to reach the non-user. The Public Relations Department of the Council of Governments has provided technical assistance in developing areawide public relations efforts. Access to those with the power to implement change has added greatly to the effectiveness of the workshop in continuing the learning process for participants and providing a mechanism for the application of workshop skills and strategies.

PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION - February 10-11

This topic served as an appropriate test module for developing methods of improving the communications between libraries and other agencies, specifically, county personnel offices. In many cases, these offices must make decisions regarding library personnel matters, e.g. job classification, recruitment and selection of employees, implementation of federal regulations, with little or no knowledge of the unique problems and constraints of libraries. In addition, the rising importance of issues pertaining to unionization, training, and career development as well as the proliferation of new federal, state and local directives on hiring and labor relations have added to the complexity of personnel administration in libraries. Many people in library management need new information relating to these issues.

It was anticipated that by bringing together librarians and personnel specialists as participants in the same workshop problems would be brought out in the open and solutions developed. Librarians could benefit from the professional expertise of the personnel specialists and the specialists would gain a better understanding of libraries. It was also hoped that access to department heads through COG committees would facilitate post-course application of those solutions. While these hopes were not realized to the degree anticipated, the degree of interaction achieved was felt to be beneficial by most of the participants.

Course Goal and Objectives

The goal of the course was to bring together librarians and personnel specialists in a workshop setting in order to identify problem areas in library personnel administration and to develop cooperative solutions to problems facing them.

Specific objectives included:

> To increase library effectiveness through improved knowledge of personnel administration by participating staff members.
>
> To increase personnel office effectiveness through increased knowledge and understanding of libraries.
>
> To develop goals and strategies for solutions in problem areas identified by participants.
>
> To promote interaction among libraries and between librarians and personnel specialists.
>
> To disseminate information and skills through participants to other library and personnel staff members.

Recruitment and Selection of Participants

Two months before the workshop the training coordinator appeared before the Personnel Officers Committee at COG. At this meeting the rationale and plan for the workshop were presented to the heads of the personnel offices of the local jurisdictions and verbal support for the idea obtained. This preliminary contact served to alert the personnel officers to the coming workshop, facilitated subsequent recruitment of participants from their offices, and identified some potential topics which might be of interest to them.

Brochures were mailed to county and school district personnel offices and public school and academic libraries. Although they are not represented on the Personnel Officers' Committee, it was originally hoped that some university personnel offices would send representatives. Despite a series of telephone calls to the personnel offices of universities whose libraries were sending participants, however, none were sent. This could have been the result of a combination of factors but does appear to support the belief that direct access to administrators through the COG committees facilitated recruitment. This preliminary contact is important in an interdisciplinary program ostensibly designed for librarians where the benefits to outside agencies may not be immediately apparent.

Twenty-four applications were received, and twenty participants, fourteen librarians and six personnel specialists, attended the course. Participants were selected to represent as many different library systems and their personnel office counterparts as possible. In some cases this was not possible and to some degree it limited the effectiveness of the workshop but for the most part the issues addressed were of a general enough nature to be applicable across jurisdictional boundaries and types of libraries.

Instructors

The workshop was facilitated by a team of two private consultants who had had extensive experience in dealing with adult learners in a variety of professions but no specific knowledge of personnel issues. Their approach was process rather than content oriented as it was anticipated that the participants themselves would serve as resources for expertise in specifc areas of personnel administration. To some degree this was realized although evaluation data indicates that the workshop would have benefited from the presence of a top level personnel officer to serve as an additional resource and present some cognitive material to stimulate discussion.

Course Content and Mode

The workshop was conducted using a process oriented participatory planning technique. While at least three days are usually required in this process, the schedule was condensed to two days here to facilitate participation by the personnel specialists. This highlights a problem that must be addressed when trying to attract outside participants to what is basically a library program. While agency heads may recognize the need for cooperation with librarians on specific issues, it is only a small part of their work and it is difficult for them to justify committing participants for more than one or two days. While shortening a workshop may preclude achievement of the benefits to be derived from a longer more intensive course, this may be a necessary compromise.

The workshop activities were divided into full group, small group, and individual tasks. The first morning the group listed issues and problems they wanted to see discussed. The issues were then prioritized and grouped into three logical sets. Participants divided into three task groups according to their interests. The small groups then discussed their set of problems and developed guidelines for resolutions.

On the second day, the task groups shared the results of their work with the other participants who suggested modifications, deletions and additions. This resulted in a fairly complete list of guidelines for each set of issues. (Appendix C) The afternoon of the second day was spent in informal group discussion of general issues and specific problems; this session was felt by many participants to be one of the most productive and revealing parts of the workshop.

Evaluation

Evaluation data indicates somewhat mixed reaction to the workshop. End-of-course evaluations indicated a high degree of satisfaction with both the content and format of the course. Of the nineteen participants completing end-of-course forms eleven rated achievement of both workshop goals and personnel goals positively and two rated these aspects negatively. Thirteen rated relevance of workshop content to their work positively and three rated it negatively. This data would seem to indicate that the workshop goals had generally been achieved by most participants.

Feedback obtained from the follow-up seminar and survey, however, revealed a somewhat lower degree of satisfaction with the workshop. In general the follow-up responses of the personnel specialists were more favorable than those of the librarians. Most of the specialists felt that they had benefited from the experience and in subsequent meetings with library personnel were better informed and more sensitive to the issues. Many of the librarians, on the other hand, felt that they had not been presented with enough substantive information and that the workshop had not been successful in meeting their need for training in specific areas of personnel administration. It would appear then, that the second workshop objective, increasing the awareness of personnel specialists, was realized more fully than the first, increasing the knowledge of librarians.

The third objective of developing problem solving strategies was realized although most participants indicated that this was not as important an aspect of the program as the full group open discussion. The fourth objective, that of promoting interaction between librarians and personnel specialists, was successfully achieved by the workshop, although there appears to have been little subsequent interaction. Most participants shared the workshop experience in some way, either through informal discussion, formal presentations at staff meetings or written reports.

Strengths

The major strengths of the workshop noted by almost all of the participants was the exposure to different perspectives afforded by the diversity of the participant make-up. The open dialogue among a variety of professionals gave participants insight into the problems of other agencies and jurisdictions. It also provided a mechanism for establishing contacts with these other organizations. Participants expressed unanimous support for including personnel specialties and librarians in the same workshop, noting that it allowed them an opportunity to clear the air on specific issues and learn from one another.

A second strength was the informality and flexibility of the workshop mode. Participants indicated that the free and open discussion of sensitive issues facilitated identification of problem areas and stimulated group interaction. This informality is mandatory in a workshop such as this where success depends largely upon the active participation of all those involved.

Weaknesses

The major weakness of the workshop was the failure to include background information on personnel administration. While most individuals welcomed the opportunity to learn from other workshop participants, many indicated that they would have liked to have some access to resource persons or materials. The value of the workshop could have been greatly increased by lengthening the duration to three days, adding a full day of lecture and/or group discussion with an expert with advanced knowledge of personnel management. This could have been supplemented with bibliographies and articles distributed to participants to be read prior to the workshop. The rest of the workshop could be conducted as described. As previously indicated, it has been the experience of this program that attracting participants from outside the library field for more than two days can be extremely difficult. In a three day course such as the one outlined above it might be feasible to invite personnel specialists for the final two days only. The effect this might have on developing group identity and interaction would, of course, have to be considered.

A second weakness, related to the first, was the forced compacting of the course from three or four to two days. Participants who complained about the amount of time required for orientation to the workshop process and identifying issues might have been less frustrated had there been an opportunity to spend more time on conflict resolution and group discussion.

A final weakness was the failure, largely attributed to financial constraints, to conduct a follow-up workshop to assess progress toward achievement of specific goals such as increased agency interaction and cooperation and dissemination of information from the workshop. Without this feedback mechanism pursuit of the cooperative goals developed was left largely to the individual. By holding a follow-up workshop, three to four months later, a timetable could have been developed citing goals to be achieved and steps to take. Methods of measuring achievement could then have been developed. Accountability to the group would serve as an impetus to individuals to work toward cooperative solutions and those strategies which proved ineffective could be modified to reflect practical considerations. Ideally this type of workshop should be reimplemented on a scheduled basis, perhaps once a year, to address new issues as they develop, orient new people and keep channels of communication open.

Outcomes

The specific outcomes from the workshop, while not as signigicant as anticipated, are nevertheless worth noting. As a result of the workshop, one jurisdiction has implemented changes in titles and class specifications and is considering a change in the career ladder. Another is planning a revision of recruitment procedures for placing employees in the library system. Less tangible results include identification of possible outlets and sources for applications and improved channels of communication between personnel departments and library supervisors.

CONSUMER PROTECTION INFORMATION - March 2-3

The need for effective collection and dissemination of consumer protection information has resulted in the formation of numerous citizens groups and consumer agencies. The resulting proliferation of services, organizations, and publications dealing with consumer issues are often confusing and difficult for the public to monitor. If libraries are to serve as effective referral centers they must be apprised of what resources are available and work closely with consumer agencies to coordinate services and disseminate information.

There were several factors which determined the inclusion of this topic in the program. It was anticipated that the existence of a Consumer Protection Committee at COG would facilitate recruitment of participants and speakers from consumer agencies and provide a mechanism for feeding back recommendations. It was felt that the potential for cooperative action in the delivery of consumer information would be increased by bringing together representatives from local public library systems and consumer agencies to exchange information about existing consumer services and develop cooperative solutions to common problems. In addition the preliminary needs assessment indicated that identification of local resources and services was an important training need among local libraries.

Course Goal and Objectives

The goal of the course was to bring librarians and consumer specialists together in a workshop setting to identify problem areas in the delivery of consumer protection information and then to develop cooperative solutions to the problems facing them.

Specific course objectives were:

- To increase library effectiveness through improved knowledge of consumer information resources and services by participating staff members.
- To increase consumer agency effectiveness through increased knowledge of library information resources and services by participating staff members.
- To develop goals and strategies for solutions to problem areas identified by participants.
- To promote interaction among libraries and between librarians and consumer specialists.
- To disseminate knowledge and skills through workshop participants to other library and consumer agency staff members.

Instructors

Instruction for the course was provided by two panels of experts in the area of consumer information. The first consisted of members of the print and broadcast media who dealt specifically with consumer affairs; the second panel was composed of representatives from public and private consumer agencies, serving a variety of constituent groups. The second day of the workshop, devoted to formation of the issues statement was facilitated by a private consultant who attended both days of the workshop to familiarize himself with the information and issues addressed on the first day.

Recruitment and Selection of Participants

The workshop was open to librarians whose responsibilities related specifically but not necessarily exclusively to consumer information and to representatives from consumer agencies. Prior to the distribution of program announcements the project staff met with the Consumer Protection Committee to inform them of the proposed course and to get their agreement to send representatives from their agencies. Announcements were then sent to public libraries and consumer agencies throughout the area. While brochures were distributed to organizations not represented on the Committee very few registrations were received from these agencies. Those that did send representatives had been contacted directly by telephone by the training coordinator.

Twenty applications were received of which 18 participants, nine librarians and nine consumer specialists, ultimately took part in the course. It had been anticipated that enrollment for this course would be slightly lower than most due to the narrow focus and specific target audience.

Course Mode and Content

The forum approach was employed in this workshop. The first day consisted of the two panel presentations, a morning panel of media representatives and an afternoon panel of consumer agency heads. Panelists presented brief overviews of the activities of their organizations, suggested areas of cooperation with libraries and other agencies and responded to questions from participants.

The second day participants reconvened to develop a formal issues statement which outlined problem areas and suggested cooperative actions for improving information dissemination in consumer affairs. (Appendix D) This statement was to be presented before the Librarians' and Consumer Protection Committees.

Evaluation

Evaluation data from participants indicates that this course was only partially successful in achieving its goals. Of the eleven participants completing end-of-course evaluations only four rated achievement of workshop goals positively and one rated it negatively. Five rated achievement of their personal goals positively and two rated it negatively. Six of the participants rated relevance of the workshop content to their work positively and nine rated it negatively. The two panel discussions were rated higher than the group seminar. Seven rated the media panel positively and nine rated it negatively; five rated the consumer agency panel positively and one rated it negatively; five rated the group seminar positively and four rated it negatively. Seven participants indicated that the panel discussions were the best aspects of the workshop and five indicated that the group seminar was the worst aspect.

It is difficult to tell whether library or consumer agency effectiveness has been significantly impacted given the limited response to the follow-up evaluations. Feedback from the evaluation seminar indicates that, at least from the library perspective it has been minimal.

The objective of promoting interaction between librarians and other professionals was partially achieved although several consumer specialists did not attend the second day, and while there has been some subsequent agency interaction there appears to have been little interaction among participants.

Strengths

The major strength of the course was the appropriateness of the factual material presented by the two panels. Participants were primarily concerned with obtaining hard information relating to specific consumer services, and consumer specialists and librarians both felt that the panels were effective in providing this type of information. Aspects which had particular impact were the identification of sources of consumer information, the overview of consumer services in other jurisdictions and the dialogue between the news media and consumer agencies. This dialogue was particularly valuable to consumer agency representatives who indicated that they welcomed the chance to discuss mutual problems and air differences.

A second strength was the interdisciplinary make-up of the participant group. Librarians and consumer specialists both indicated that this contributed to a better understanding of the roles they play in consumer education and the dissemination of information.

Weaknesses

The most widely criticized aspect of the workshop was the participant seminar. Most of the participants felt that this was a waste of their time and not productive in terms of developing practical solutions. Not enough factual information was presented to give participants the feeling of having gained sufficient knowledge from attending the course. It is possible that two days of panel discussions would have offset this feeling and provided more input for developing the issues statement.

Many participants felt that implementation of the goals they had developed in the group seminar was impossible due to fiscal and resource limitations. More emphasis should have been placed on developing practical strategies, with achievable goals, rather than the brain storming approach that was employed.

A third factor which detracted from the success of the course was the low rate of attendance by consumer specialists at the group seminar. In a follow-up telephone survey of those who had not returned most indicated that their agencies had not felt they could spare them for the two days, and that they had felt the panel discussions would be more valuable than the seminar. More pre-course contact with agency heads concerning the specific goals and format of the course might have garnered greater support for the problem solving aspects of this workshop.

Outcomes

The issues statement generated by participants was presented before the Librarians' Committee. Originally it was intended that the document be presented before the Consumer Protection Committee but that Committee was operationally dissolved before this could be accomplished.

As a result of the workshop consumer agencies have requested that they be allowed to preview consumer films with librarians to provide assistance in the selection of films and other materials and the project staff has distributed informational materials produced by the news media to area libraries. Based on the issues raised at the workshop COG has submitted a grant proposal to the Office of Consumer Education for the development of a model consumer education curriculum for librarians that includes cooperative interaction between librarians and consumer agencies. Response to that proposal is forthcoming. In addition, the information and services available in and through libraries have been featured in the consumer columns of local newspapers.

Libraries and consumer agencies are currently considering the following cooperative programs: placing consumer specialists in bookmobiles to reach low-income and low population communities; initiating consumer agency contact with institutions through library outreach programs; using the Spanish consumer agency to translate and disseminate library publications.

PLANNING AND BUDGETING - April 6-7-8

As new methods of budgeting and program accountability are employed by local governments and organizations, it becomes increasingly important for librarians to understand the principles underlying their use. If librarians are to be effective in defending their own programs in times of fiscal constraint they must be able to respond to regional planning priorities, utilize a variety of budgeting techniques and identify appropriate alternatives for financial support.

Goals and Objectives

The goal of this course was to introduce participants to theories and techniques which would help them deal more effectively with issues and problems in the areas of planning, budgeting and grant solicitation.

Specific course objectives included:

1. To increase library effectiveness through improved knowledge of techniques of planning, budgeting and grant solicitation.
2. To increase individual competencies in specific areas
   a. Use of regional data in planning
   b. Program evaluation
   c. Budgeting methods and techniques
   d. Grant solicitation from federal agencies

    e. Grant solicitation from private foundations

3. To disseminate information through participants to other library staff members (informal communication, workshop replication, etc.)

4. To promote interaction among librarians and between librarians and other professionals.

Recruitment and Selection of Participants

Publicity brochures were distributed to school, public, academic and special libraries in an attempt to see whether this topic would lend itself to mixing participants by type of library. Participants were selected to represent a variety of types of libraries in a number of different jurisdictions. The best response was from public and academic libraries who sent the majority of representatives.

Participants were also elected on the basis of job responsibility, that is, those with direct responsibility for library development, budgeting, or grant solicitation. Thirty-eight applications were received from which twenty-eight participants were selected to attend classes.

Instructors

Instruction in planning and budgeting was provided by representatives from local, regional and federal government agencies, including the Council of Governments. The COG affiliation proved to be extremely valuable in providing access to professionals in other governmental agencies. The five person panel on grantsmanship was made up of representatives from federal and private funding agencies. Though most participants felt the panel to be well rounded and informative, it would have been improved by the inclusion of a representative from the business sector, as private foundations tend not to fund public agencies such as public libraries.

Course Mode and Content

Instruction was presented primarily through formal lecture although a few participatory exercises were included as was a question and answer session on the last day.

Lectures on the first day dealt with ways libraries could relate to regional planning and types of regional data that are collected and can be used in program planning. Also included was a component on program evaluation which considered ways of establishing measurements of program effectiveness. A paper discussing measures of accountability for libraries was developed by two instructors and distributed prior to the workshop. (Appendix E). The second day covered budgeting theory and techniques, focusing on those aspects of the federal budgeting process which are parallel to municipal and county procedures. Some participatory exercises were included to reinforce concepts and provide practice in theory application. On the third day, a representative from the Department of Libraries and Learning Resources of HEW and a representative from a private foundation discussed the mechanics of proposal writing and grant solicitation. In the afternoon, a panel of representatives from various federal and private funding agencies gave brief overviews of the activities of their organizations and responded to questions from participants.

Evaluation

Evaluation data reveals a mixed reaction to the course and would seem to indicate that it was not completely successful in achieving its goal of introducing librarians to useful information in areas of planning, budgeting and grantsmanship. Only half the respondents indicated that they had benefited from the session on regional planning and slightly less benefited from the budgeting component while all felt that the panel was a valuable component. Sixteen out of twenty felt that they had learned some useful information from the grant solicitation component. Most felt that the lecture presentations were of more value than the panel because they offered more specific information. Fourteen out of the twenty indicated that they had benefited from the section on program evaluation. Thirteen participants felt that the workshop had provided them with concrete skills that could be applied to their present job. The one participant who had previously attended a workshop on this topic given by librarians indicated that the previous course had been more relevant and specific.

Of the ten persons returning follow-up questionnaires two felt the course goal had been achieved very well, five felt it had been achieved quite well and three indicated that it had been achieved somewhat. Those who responded positively cited the variety of instructors and interaction with other participants as contributing factors. Those who entered negative comments indicated that the course material had been inappropriate for their needs.

Strengths

One of the major strengths of this course was the quality and appropriateness of the grantsmanship component. Most of the participants felt this to be an important topic and indicated that they appreciated the opportunity to speak directly with representatives of various funding agencies. This allowed them not only to ask direct questions but also to become familiar with specific individuals and understand some of the internal policies and procedural factors which affect the funding process.

The section on program evaluation was also felt by most to be an asset. The appropriateness of the subject and the quality of instruction were augmented by the paper developed specifically for the course. While the paper was developed for public libraries participants from other types of organizations have indicated that the information was applicable to their work situations.

Weaknesses

Perhaps the major weakness of this course was that it attempted to do too much. The mixed participant response would seem to indicate that the content was appropriate for some and not for others. Many of those whose jobs related to grant solicitation had little interest in budgeting theory and vice-versa. In addition, this was not a course which lent itself to mixing participants by type of library, especially in the budgeting component. The course might have been improved if the participants had been allowed to separate into groups by type of library and discuss specific issues related to their particular situations. The grantsmanship component should, perhaps, have been offered as a separate one day course for a different target group.

Another weakness was the non-participatory nature of the course. Most of the information was presented via lecture and there was little chance for informal discussion or small group participation. Many participants felt that this was a definite hindrance in that they had little opportunity to apply theories or learn from the other participants. More emphasis should have been placed on promoting group interaction and participation.

The information on regional planning and data was felt by many of the participants to be inappropriate. Most indicated that they would have preferred more emphasis on the principles of planning as applied to institutional management rather than regional development.

SUPERVISORY SKILLS - May 7-8-10

The role of the supervisor in problem resolution and effective staff management is a key factor in the successful operation of any organization. The ability to motivate employees, utilize time efficiently and make effective decisions is especially crucial in times of tight budgets and staff reductions.

The rationale for selecting this topic was similar to that applied in the selection of Communications Techniques. The problems affecting supervision of personnel are not usually determined by the type of library involved, and the solutions developed in the business and behavioral science fields are generally applicable in any type of organization. It was, therefore, felt that this topic would attract participants from a broad cross section of libraries, especially those from organizations in the private sector who had not been highly represented in previous workshops. In addition, a survey of educational opportunities for librarians revealed that most management courses were directed toward upper level management rather than line supervisors.

Course Goal and Objectives

The course goal was to introduce participants to theories and techniques which would help them to more effectively supervise their staffs. Specific objectives included:

1. To increase library effectiveness through improved knowledge of techniques and theories of supervision by participating staff members.

2. To increase individual competencies in specific areas of supervision.

    a. Supervisory Styles

    b. Time management

    c. Decision-making

    d. Motivation

3. To disseminate information through participants to other library staff members (informal communications, workshop replication, etc.)

4. To promote interaction among librarians and between librarians and other professionals.

Recruitment and Selection of Participants

In addition to the channels utilized in other workshops, the publicizing of this course was accomplished by a direct mailing of program announcements to the members of the largest of the local library associations. It was hoped that this would attract participants from organizations not involved in earlier programs and reach some librarians who were not tied into the established communications network.

While expensive and time consuming, this proved to be effective in attracting librarians from a variety of types of libraries and resulted in a higher degree of representation from the smaller special and Federal libraries. In fact, several of the participants from larger libraries whose administrative offices had been receiving announcements indicated that this was the first time they had seen the brochures. There were some minor drawbacks in that the direct mailing resulted in the receipt of many more applications than could be accepted. This caused some degree of frustration on the part of those who could not be accepted, especially as selection was based on a number of criteria and applicants who submitted their registration forms early were not necessarily those who were chosen.

Fifty applications were received out of which 27 librarians were selected to participate. Selection was based on the applicant's position, the type of library he or she represented and the date of receipt of the application. This was an introductory course with the material designed to address behavioral problems of supervision rather than policy issues such as those dealt with in the course on Personnel Administration. The participants selected were, therefore, primarily line librarians with supervisory responsibilities and little or no formal training in this area.

Instructors

Instruction was provided by four private consultants with expertise in management training all of whom had had extensive experience in dealing with adult learners from a variety of disciplines. Two of the instructors worked as a team but the others had not worked together previously.

Because of this and because the distinctions between the subtopics are not clearly defined, e.g., motivation being an aspect of supervisory style, the potential was high for duplication or discontinuity. Consequently, a planning meeting was held between the training coordinator and the instructors prior to the course. At this meeting, instructors discussed lecture material, group exercises, and supplementary materials. Participant expectations from the pre-course survey were also discussed and strategies developed for addressing specific needs.

Course Content and Mode

As with the course on Communications Techniques, this workshop was designed to encourage as much individual and group participation as possible, allowing librarians from different types of organizations and with different professional orientations to interact and learn from each other. The behavioral aspects of the field of employee supervision itself dictate an emphasis on experiential rather than cognitive content in a course on this topic. The course, therefore, contained a minimum of lecture material and emphasized instead the use of group exercises and informal discussion.

Through lectures and films, participants were introduced to specific theories of management style (Maslow, Blake-Monton, McGregor), time management (Laken), decision-making (Gordon), and motivation (Herzberg). These theories were then amplified through individual and group activities, case study analysis, and problem solving exercises. In addition, whenever possible, participants were encouraged to present specific problems relating to their work situation for the group to solve. In this way common problem areas were identified and solutions appropriate to libraries were worked out mutually by the professionals in both fields. This cooperative problem solving process proved to very effective in adapting instructional content to bridge the gap between instructors and participants. Participants voiced strong support for this approach and recommended that an increased amount of time be spent in this way.

While the course was being conducted, a video tape was made of the lecture presentations. It was anticipated that this might be useful to participants in conducting mini-workshops at their own institutions. A test workshop is currently being conducted by one of the participants to determine the effectiveness of the tape as an instructional aid. Despite the possible usefulness of the tape, the taping process itself proved somewhat disruptive to the class, some of whom felt that the instructors were lecturing to the camera. In addition, a few participants indicated that they were inhibited from speaking directly on sensitive issues.

Evaluation

Evaluation data indicated that this course was quite successful in achieving its goal of introducing librarians to skills and techniques which would help them in supervising their staffs. All of the participants indicated that they had learned concrete skills which could be applied to their present jobs. The most commonly mentioned areas were time-management and motivation although many participants also commented on the value of the leadership component.

Twenty-one of the twenty-five submitting end-of-course evaluation forms indicated that the course had met or exceeded their expectations. The most frequently cited contributing factors were quality of instructors and content. Of the four who indicated that the course had not met their expectations, three cited not enough attention to specific library problems as the cause. Despite this, all of the five who had attended similar workshops given by librarians felt that this was more effective, indicating that the management experts were more knowledgeable about their subjects and that the sessions were run more efficiently.

The content of the course met with the approval of most of the participants. Twenty-four indicated that the course had almost always or frequently been informative. All felt that the materials had been understandable. Two felt that there had been too much emphasis on theory; the rest felt that the presentations had been fairly balanced. The information was felt by thirteen to be very relevant to their occupational needs and by twelve to be fairly relevant. Seven of the participants felt that decision-making had been covered insufficiently and four would have preferred more emphasis on time management. Five wanted more emphasis on specific problem solving and case study analysis. Suggested additional areas included issues for new supervisors, managing supervisors, and evaluating employees. Nineteen felt that they had gotten useful information from other workshop participants and many indicated that they would have preferred even more time for interaction.

An insufficient number of follow-up evaluations have been received to date to include that data in the evaluation. Instructors commented favorably on the enthusiasm and responsiveness of participants. The only suggested change in format was to expand the time management and decision-making components. Based on their contact with the group, all of the instructors felt the topics to be very relevant to the needs of librarians.

Strengths

A major strength of the program was the quality of instruction. The instructors were well organized, knowledgeable and able to convey their material effectively. With very few exceptions, participants rated them favorably. It should be noted that all of the instructors had had extensive experience in conducting courses of this type. They were, therefore, familiar with some of the potential problems inherent in an interdisciplinary program and were responsive to the needs of the participants. The generally favorable response and specific comments of participants would seem to support the opinion that in an interdisciplinary program such as this, the more experience instructors have in dealing with diverse groups the more effective their presentations will be.

The instructional content of the workshop was another positive factor. The librarians expressed a definite need for training in the areas covered, especially time-management and motivation. Those who had had some formal training in management in graduate school felt that this was an opportunity for them to relate theory to the practical problems they faced in their work situation and most of those who had had previous exposure to some of the theoretical material felt that this was a valuable refresher course.

The mixture of librarians from a variety of institutions and jurisdictions was also regarded by many as an asset. The informal atmosphere and many small group exercises allowed participants to meet and discuss their concerns with a variety of librarians facing similar management problems. Many indicated that they appreciated the opportunity not only to discuss mutual problems but also to become acquainted with the operational differences among libraries.

Weaknesses

Perhaps the major weakness of the course was the attempt to address too many topics in the time allotted. Many of the participants felt that the decision-making and time management topics were covered either insufficiently or shallowly. It would probably have been preferable to expand the workshop to four days or delete one or another of the topics. As the participants felt that all the topics were relevant, expanding the course would probably have added to the difficulty of obtaining leave and increased the cost of the course.

Another weakness was in the failure to include enough specifically library-related material, case-studies, problems unique to libraries, etc. While not all the participants felt that this was an important aspect, the inclusion of this type of material would no doubt have added to the value of the course. This could have been achieved in a number of ways. The training coordinator, as a librarian, could have worked with the instructors prior to the course to develop some library related case studies. An alternative would have been to instruct participants to develop their own cases to be brought to class and used in either full or small group exercises.

Based on the success of the workshop and the apparent demand for training in this area, COG is currently planning to hold the course again after the completion of this program. It is hoped that this course will be the first in a series of self-supporting continuing educational courses sponsored by the Librarians Committee.

Evaluations and Recommendations 3

Project Evaluation

The favorable response of participants, instructors library administrators and the COG staff to this program strongly supports the interdisciplinary, cooperative approach to continuing library education. The dual goal of encouraging cooperation and communication among librarians and between librarians and other professionals and introducing librarians to useful skills and techniques from other fields was felt to be achieved in varying degrees in all of the courses. Most participants felt that they had benefited in some way from their involvement in the program. While some recommended changes in the individual modules there was almost universal support for the overall approach. Of special importance to them was the opportunity to interact with professionals from different organizations and jurisdictions and the opportunity to implement change through access to administrators.

Because of the low response rate to follow-up surveys and the lack of staff available to conduct an in-depth assessment of the long-range effects of program participation, it is difficult to determine the degree to which the program objectives of increasing overall library effectiveness and individual staff competencies were achieved. It should be noted that in any training program these effects are difficult to measure. They are not easily quantified or evaluated, being open to individual interpretation and subject to a variety of outside influences.

Evaluation data that is available indicates that many participants felt their competencies had in fact been improved and that their new skills had been useful in their work. While these are admittedly subjective assessments they do provide a limited means by which to measure the achievement of this objective.

There is little concrete evidence to support the belief that the effectiveness of participating librarians has been measurably improved. The continued support of the program by library administrators beyond the funded period, however, gives some indication of their satisfaction with the program.

While the program was, of course, designed primarily to benefit the participants it was also hoped that by participating in the program as instructors other professionals would expand their knowledge and understanding of libraries. Most of the instructors felt that this had been the case and that they had benefited from this exposure to the needs of librarians and the problems they face as professionals.

Based on their knowledge of libraries and interaction with participants almost all of the instructors indicated that their topics were relevant to the library field. (The only exception was in the area of regional planning. This assessment is supported by the response of participants, many of whom felt that the topic was of only marginal interest.) In some cases, instructors recommended that advanced follow-up courses be arranged so that participants could further develop their skills. Many participants also supported this suggestion, particularly in the areas of communications techniques, public relations, and supervision.

Instructors were also asked to note any differences between librarians and other groups they had addressed with similar presentations. Two instructors indicated that librarians seemed more concerned that illustrative materials, case studies, problem samples, etc. relate directly to their field than most groups.

Generally the instructors recognized the importance of working closely with the training coordinator and other speakers prior to the workshops and felt that the time spent on planning and coordinating the courses was justified. All felt the pre-course participant surveys to be especially useful to them in preparing their presentations.

The objectives of the project staff were largely achieved. The value of interdisciplinary education for librarians was demonstrated and a viable model was developed for use by other agencies. Librarians were provided with needed information and skills not available to them through traditional programs. Just as important, the network of informal ties between professional librarians was strengthened and expanded. While in some courses, the results were less dramatic than had been hoped, in others the unanticipated outcomes greatly exceeded staff expectations. The establishment and subsequent effectiveness of the Public Relations Task Force, the cooperative efforts initiated between libraries and consumer agencies and the active dissemination of new information by participants to other library staff members are evidence that continuing education can be active rather than passive and that it can serve as a catalyst for the development of cooperative programs among libraries and between libraries and other agencies. These programs could not have been effected without the support of library administrators and agency heads with a demonstrated commitment to cooperation. This in turn evidences the effectiveness of an organization such as COG as the sponsoring agency for such continuing education activities. In this respect the goals of COG and of the library community have become mutually supportive.

Guidelines for Implementation

The following recommendations and observations reflect the opinions of the project staff based on their own experiences in developing the program and suggestions made to them from participants, advisors and administrators. They are offered as guidelines to others who might be interested in adopting all or part of this model. They include not only what was done and what proved to be effective in this context but also suggested modifications and alternatives which should add to the value of the program if implemented elsewhere.

1. Topic selection
   - Prior to the development of any such project, an indepth needs assessment should be conducted to determine training needs perceived not only by library administrators and supervisors but also by potential participants. This will determine what training priorities are not being met by existing programs and identify important subtopics which can be included in course syllabi. Though time-consuming and somewhat limited, personal contact with potential participants via the telephone can be beneficial in establishing an interest on the part of the target community and providing project staff with a functional vocabulary with which to attract participants.
2. Liaisons
   - The initial purpose of this contact is to identify the continuing education priorities of specific organizations, and assess the commitment of administrators to sending participants to courses. This contact

should be maintained throughout the program so that the training staff can gauge the success of the courses in meeting the objectives of participating libraries. It will also allow administrators to participate in program development and make informed decisions in selecting appropriate participants and arranging scheduling. This contact later becomes even more important if policy changes or actions on recommendations are expected outcomes of the program. Regular reports presented before the Librarians' Committee throughout this program facilitated implementation of recommendations. Participants and and administrators were provided with a unique opportunity to work toward mutual goals. If a body such as the Librarians' Committee does not exist in other areas contact might be made through written surveys or, preferably, personal or telephone interviews.

° If possible, an advisory committee of representatives from participating libraries or types of libraries should be established to provide a more direct link with the target community. With adequate evaluation and communication this builds into the program an on-going review mechanism which will help assure flexibility and responsiveness by providing feedback on participant satisfaction. In this way, outcomes can be assessed without the use of written surveys. In this program the committee was composed of mid-level administrators with direct contact with both participants and policy makers, a factor which can be especially beneficial in large libraries or systems where directors may have little direct contact with line staff. In some instances, committee members were able to follow through on participant recommendations which did not require the attention of top administrators.

- If the program is to include participants from outside the library field, direct contact must also be initated and maintained with the heads of appropriate outside agencies. This is necessary so that the relevance of specific courses to the needs of other agencies can be established.

In addition, an assessment should be made to determine the perceived needs of those agencies vis-a-vis libraries and what factors may affect their participation in the program, e.g., the number of staff members they can send, the number of days they would be able to attend, etc. In this program, involvement of agency heads in determining course objectives and their awareness of possible outcomes facilitated recruitment of participants and implementation of course recommendations. This contact also provided the project staff with a means of discovering possible long-range effects of course participation on these agencies. Regional planning agencies with similar committees exist in most urban areas; if this avenue is not available, however, personal or telephone interviews with individual administrators are possible alternatives.

3. Instructors

   - It was generally true of this program that those instructors with some experience in teaching adults in a variety of disciplines in addition to having subject expertise were more effective than those who were practicing subject experts. The experienced teachers or trainers were generally better able to gauge the reactions of participants and respond to their needs;

additionally they were aware of the potential problems inherent in an interdisciplinary course and more willing to devote time to pre-course adaptation. In addition, the ability of an instructor to communicate effectively is highly subjective, and while content can be monitored to some degree prior to the course it is difficult if not impossible to determine the quality of an instructor's presentation before it is delivered. When working with an experienced trainer it is often possible to examine evaluation data from previously held courses to determine his or her strengths in terms of delivery and audience contact. There are necessarily some caveats which must be included with the above observation. Some topics can, of course, be addressed most easily by practitioners, sources of consumer services and information or the policies of specific funding agencies, for example. Indeed, in these cases instructors were very favorably received by participants. It is also true that many subject experts are practiced public speakers and may be experienced at addressing groups from fields other than their own.

- Any cooperative problem-solving course should be conducted by trained facilitators who can guide participants through the development of specific strategies. Facilitators should act to keep discussions from focusing too long on specific issues and monitor activities to assure the achievement of course objectives. This control is especially valuable in courses involving participants from different fields in seeing that the needs of both groups are met. This type of workshop can be very disruptive if the sensitive issues raised are not dealt with constructively. The interagency conflict which could result would counteract the cooperative goals of the course.

4. Participants

- Program announcements should include a profile of whom the course is designed for. This profile should include the position, job responsibilities, and degree of subject expertise of the ideal applicant. This permits potential applicants to determine whether or not the course is designed to meet their needs and allows supervisors to make more effective decisions as to who they want to send to the course.

- Applicants should be instructed to include a personal profile with their registration forms. This should include the applicant's job responsibilities, number of years in present position, previous exposure to course topics either through formal education or training or independent study, major course expectations and areas where he or she hopes to see improvement as a result of course attendance. This is especially valuable in an interdisciplinary program as previous exposure to course material and relevance to job responsibilities may vary greatly among librarians. This will help the training staff in selecting participants and provide instructors with a framework for course development.
- If communication and cooperation are intended program outcomes as much diversity as possible should be incorporated into the participant make-up of the courses. This diversification proved extremely beneficial in this program. Participants became familiar with a variety of librarians and other professionals and increased their knowledge of libraries and library resources in the area. Through informal and group discussion participants became acquainted

with the policies and programs developed by other systems, schools and agencies, identifying common problems and discussing alternative solutions.

° Mixing participants by political jurisdiction was valuable in all the courses. Specific problems were discussed freely by participants, perhaps more so than if they had been attending in-house courses with their co-workers.

° Diversification by type of library was generally considered a positive aspect of most of the courses, especially those dealing with individual skills such as communication and supervision. In some workshops some of the participants felt that the focus had been concentrated too much on one type of library and that their needs had not been addressed specifically enough; at the same time, however, they indicated that they welcomed the exposure to librarians from other types of agencies. A suggested solution would be to have some full group general sessions and some small group sessions designed for specific groups. This would, of course, have fiscal and logistical consequences which would have to be considered.

- In the two workshops which involved librarians and other professionals as participants this was felt to be very beneficial by both groups. Participants felt that they had learned from their exposure to people with different viewpoints and professional skills and welcomed the chance to discuss common problems and clarify misconceptions.

5. Course Content and Mode

   - Participants should be informed of specific course objectives prior to the course. Program announcements should be clear as to what will be covered and whether the emphasis is to be on problem solving or cognitive material. This is especially true when dealing with process-oriented courses such as those now employed in many areas of management as participants may be unfamiliar with the instructional methods employed. If instructors are brought in from other disciplines, program announcements should also stipulate whether the topic will be addressed from that perspective and to what degree material has been adapted specifically to the library field.

- Courses which are devoted to developing cooperative problem-solving strategies or issues statements should include some cognitive material, either through formal lectures, by the inclusion of subject experts as resource people, or by distributing appropriate reading material prior to the course.
- This will give participants a common body of knowledge with which to work in defining problem areas. In addition, it has the psychological advantage of giving participants something tangible they can come away with as problem solving strategies may require considerable time and effort before their benefits are fully realized. Instructors should be flexible enough to adapt the content of their presentations to the specific needs of librarians. Case studies, lecture examples, group exercises and supplementary materials such as bibliographies should be adapted as much as possible to the library environment. This will in some cases require that instructors spend extra time in preparation but is invaluable in assuring that content is relevant and applicable. The training coordinator should work

closely with instructors during this phase. Pre-course planning meetings should be held and appropriate articles from library literature should be given to instructors prior to the courses to acquaint them with some of the problems librarians face in specific subject areas.

- Training coordinators interested in developing interdisciplinary programs may want to explore the possibility of emphasizing advanced material in some of their courses. In recent years, there has been greater emphasis on the interdisciplinary approach to continuing library education and most of the courses developed have been designed to introduce librarians to basic theories and skills assuming, that this will be their first exposure to the subjects. In this program it was found that while there is still a need for introductory courses in many areas, some librarians would like the opportunity to develop their skills to a more sophisticated level. The ultimate decision must, of course, depend on the results of in-depth needs assessments of the target community.

- While the inclusion of some theoretical material is necessary to provide a base from which to develop action steps and behavior modification, courses should emphasize the practical application of concepts. Participants in the program were generally more interested in specific sources of information, practical suggestions and how-to exercises than in in-depth theoretical analyses. They were interested only in those aspects of the subject which related directly to their own work situations. They were also concerned that action plans be both practical and attainable. Problem-solving strategies which involved major policy changes or resources that were not readily available were frustrating and generally regarded as a waste of time.

6. Staff

   - If possible, the training coordinator should be an experienced professional librarian with some skill in educational programming since he or she must work closely with instructors prior to the course to develop appropriate case studies and bibliographies and acquaint them with some of the problems and constraints peculiar to libraries. The coordinator can also survey the professional library literature and supply instructors with appropriate articles reflecting the state of the art of the subject at hand as regards the library field. This person should act as a monitor at the workshops themselves and advise instructors as to the appropriateness of the material as it is presented.

- If cooperative action is a desired program outcome, some means should be established for follow-up on specific course recommendations and strategies. To some degree this can be accomplished by a committee of administrators or advisors. However, in a large workshop program where the cooperative plans may become more involved and diverse this might necessitate hiring additional staff to coordinate task forces, liaison with outside agencies, plan follow-up courses, and monitor long range outcomes.

7. Dissemination

- Participants should be encouraged both by workshop personnel and administrators to disseminate information to other staff members. Dissemination activities employed by participants in this program have included conducting mini-workshops using course materials and/or instructors, making presentations at staff meetings, and through informal discussion. In this way, the impact of the courses has been multiplied to affect a greater portion of the library community.

Conclusion

Continuation of this project has received the strong support of the Librarians' Committee and other segments of the Washington library community. Based on the success of this program the Librarians' Committee has established a permanent Continuing Education Task Force composed largely of selected members of the project advisory committee. The objectives of that committee are to develop further continuing education courses compatible with local training priorities, explore alternative methods of providing financial support for continuing education efforts, and serve as a clearinghouse for information on continuing education activities in the Washington area.

The reactions of participants and others involved in the program attest to the validity of this model. While some aspects of the program have proved more successful than others, with some modifications this should be an effective model for other libraries, associations or cooperatives to use in developing their own programs. As a result of the program librarians have learned valuable skills from outside the library field which have aided them in the performance of their jobs and increased their knowledge of Washington library resources and personnel. In addition librarians and other professionals have been afforded the opportunity to meet, exchange information and professional viewpoints, and develop a rapport which it is hoped will carry over beyond the scope of this project. The success of this project supports the belief that communication and cooperation among libraries and between libraries and other agencies can be improved through an effective interdisciplinary continuing education program.

Appendices

4

These appendices are overviews of the courses developed for this program. They include course objectives, topics, resource materials, major strengths and weaknesses, bibliographies, documents developed by instructors and participants, and sample evaluation forms. They are intended to provide background information for those interested in duplicating all or part of this program.

PAGE
A. Communications Techniques. . . . . . 109 - 112
B. Advertising and Public Relations . . 113 - 121
C. Personnel Administration . . . . . . 122 - 133
D. Consumer Protection Information. . . 134 - 145
E. Planning and Budgeting . . . . 146 - 168
F. Supervisory Skills . . . . 169 - 174
G. Evaluation Forms . . . . 175 - 190

APPENDIX A

COMMUNICATION TECHNIQUES

November 4, 5, 6, 1975

OBJECTIVES

1. To increase library effectiveness through improved knowledge of communications techniques by participating staff members.
2. To increase individual competencies in specific areas of communication:
    a. Interpersonal communication
    b. Non-verbal communication
    c. Use of language in communication
    d. Written communication
    e. Oral presentations
3. To disseminate information through participants to other library staff members (informal communication, workshop replication, etc.)
4. To promote interaction among librarians.

DISCUSSION/LECTURE TOPICS

The dynamics of listening
One and two-way communication
Perception and the transmission of information
Facts and inferences
The process of language
Body language
English versus communication
Factors of written communication
Writing clearer memos
Writing announcements
Resumes and employment letters
Effective oral communication

MATERIALS

Films:

Measure of Understandings, Rountable Films 113 No. Dan Vincent Blvd., Beverly Hills, California.

Louder Than Words, Maps, Models Metaphors, and Mind the Gap, International Society for General Semantics, P. O. Box 2469, San Francisco, Calif. 94126.

Books:

Know What I Mean, by Portia Meares and Victor Krepton, International Society for General Semantics, P. O. Box 2469, San Francisco, Calif. 94126.

Bibliography:
Pg. 112

MODE

Traditional workshop mode includes lectures full and small group exercises, and informal discussion.

INSTRUCTORS

1 university professor
2 private consultants

Mr. Roye Frye
Associate Rector
Grace Episcopal Church
3601 Russell Road
Alexandria, Virginia 22205
820-9442 (H)

Ms. Portia K. Meares
988 North Quantico Street
Arlington, Virginia 22205
533-8245 (H)

Ms. Nona Bear Wegner
Director of Public Relations
Howard University
14000 Castle Blvd.
Silver Spring, Maryland

PARTICIPANTS	6 public librarians 4 school librarians 2 academic libraries 1 special librarian
STRENGTHS	Participatory mode Diversity of participants Capability of instructors Variety of subtopics
WEAKNESSES	Poor coordination between course components Failure to specify target groups

BIBLIOGRAPHY

COMMUNICATION TECHNIQUES

Buber, Martin. *I and Thou*. New York: Scribner, 1958.

Fabun, Don. *The Dynamics of Change*. Edgewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1967.

Fabun, Don. "Communications." Kaiser Aluminum, 1965.

Fast, Julius. *Body Language*. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Co., 1970.

Gregory, R.L. *The Intelligent Eye*. McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Hall, Edward. *The Silent Language*. Doubleday, 1959. Reprinted by Premier Books.

Hall, Edward. *The Hidden Dimension*. Doubleday, 1966.

Haney, William. *Communication and Organizational Behavior*. Homewood, Illinois: Irwin and Co., 1967.

Hayakawa, S.I. *Language in Thought and Action*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1963.

Howe, Revel. *The Miracle of Dialogue*. Seabury Press.

Huxley, A. "Education on the Non-Verbal Level." Daedalus, Spring, 1962.

Johnson, Wendall. *Your Most Enchanted Listener*. New York: Harper and Row, 1956.

Laird, Charlton. *The Miracle of Language*. Greenwich, Conn.: Fawcett Publications, Inc., 1965.

Langer, Suzanne. *Philosophy in a New Key*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1967.

Whorf, Benjamin. *Language, Thought and Reality*. Cambridge, Mass.: Technology Press of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1956.

APPENDIX B

ADVERTISING AND PUBLIC RELATIONS

December 1, 2, 4, 1975

OBJECTIVES

1. To increase library effectiveness through improved knowledge of advertising and public relations by participating staff members.
2. To increase individual competencies in specific areas of advertising and public relations:
   a. The basic theories of public relations
   b. Use of public information in program development
   c. Visual and graphic communications
   d. Use of the media in public relations
3. To disseminate information through participants to other library staff members (informal communication, workshop replication, etc.)
4. To promote interaction among librarians and between librarians and other professionals.

DISCUSSION/LECTURE TOPICS

Public Relations Theory
Role of Public information in program planning
Visual communications in the library
Writing and placing press releases
Working in civic clubs and schools
Using exhibits
Working in the broadcast media

MATERIALS

Pamphlets:

If You Want Air Time, National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street, NW Washington, D. C. 20036 35¢

Opening Doors for the Handicapped, Publicity Guide, The President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, Washington, D. C. 20210

Dealing With the Total Press, United States Independent Telephone Association, 438 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C. 20004

Pointers for Publicists, National Alliance of Businessmen, 1730 K Street, NW, Washington, D. C. 20006

Bibliography:
Pg. 116-118

MODE

Traditional workshop mode including lectures, full and small group exercises and informal discussion

INSTRUCTORS

1 private consultant
2 representatives of government agencies
1 university professor

Mr. Dave Brown
Special Assistant to the Public Printer
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D. C. 20401
275-2958

Mr. David Pesanelli
4301 Connecticut Avenue, NW,
Suite 406
Washington, D. C. 20008
363-4760

INSTRUCTOR (Cont'd)	Mr. John Couric American Podiatry Association 20 Chevy Chase Circle, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20015 362-4700 Mr. Bernard Posner Associate Director of the President's Commission on Employment of the Handicapped Department of Labor Washington, D.C. 20210 961-3401
PARTICIPANTS	19 public librarians 2 school librarians 3 academic 1 special librarian
STRENGTHS	Emphasis on practical approach Caliber of Instructors
WEAKNESSES	Overly diversified target groups Failure to include high level administrators as participants
OUTCOMES	Public Relations Task Force
DOCUMENTS	"Basic Strategies for Improving Graphic Communication" Pg. 119-121

A PUBLIC RELATIONS BIBLIOGRAPHY

Compiled by the Publications Committee
Public Relations Section, Library Administration Division
AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

Adams, Alexander B. Apollo Handbook of Practical Public Relations: The Non-professional's Guide to News Media and Techniques. Apollo, 1970 $2.65 (paper).

> A basic guide to getting the message across to the people you want to reach. Practical information on writing press releases, folders, and other materials.

Angoff, Allan, ed. Public Relations for Libraries. Greenwood Publishing Corp. Expected date of publication 1973.

> A volume in the Contributions in Librarianship and Information Science Series. Contributors offer hard-hitting advice for a wide variety of libraries.

Bernays, Edward L. Public Relations. University of Oklahoma, 1970. $5.95.

> The classic work in the field traces the origin and development of public relations from earliest times to present. Principles and practices of public relations are examined and actual case histories are detailed.

Brier, Warren J., and Howard C. Heyn. Writing for Newspapers and News Services. Funk & Wagnalls, 1969. $7.95.

> Good advice on how to attain the styles of writing best suited to the various media - newspapers, news services, radio and TV.

Budd, John F., Jr. An Executive's Primer on Public Relations. Chilton Book Co., 1969. $5.95

> Library administrators can derive much of value from this book, written primarily for businessmen. A well-written, easily read exposition of the "whys and wherefores" of public relations - not a how-to-do-it book.

Bundy, Mary Lee, with Sylvia Goodstein, eds. The Library's Public Revisited. University of Maryland, 1967. $3.00 (paper).

> Studies of the various sections of society that come into contact with the public library - the "publics" with whom the P.R. specialist must deal.

Burke, Clifford. Printing It: A guide to Graphic Techniques for the Impecunious. Ballentine Books, 1972. $2.95 (paper).

Layout, starting a small printing department, paper, presses - you name it, it's here - described in clear, concise language, without an excess of detail. Highly recommended.

Canfield, Bertrand R. Public Relations: Principles, Cases, and Problems. Richard D. Irwin, 1968. 5th edition. $15.95 (text ed.). $9.25 (paper)

Completely re-written, re-illustrated edition of a standard text on the art of public relations as it can be applied to both the corporate and institutional worlds. New case studies.

Chamber of Commerce of the U.S. Association Public Relations and Communications Guide. Author, 1968. $4.50.

A good basic work with much concrete information, including material on the most important means of communication with the public, from mass media to the spoken word.

Colpan, Kate, and Edwin Castagna, eds. The Library Reaches Out. Oceana, 1965. $10.00

Detailed case studies of library outreach to children, teenagers, adults, the economically and culturally deprived.

Coplan, Kate. Poster Ideas and Bulletin Board Techniques for Libraries and Schools. Oceana, 1965. $9.00

Garvey, Mona. Library Displays: Their Purpose, Construction, and Use. H.W. Wilson, 1969. $7.50

An excellent little book full of basic information for those who wish to brighten their library and inform their patrons. Helpful illustrations.

Hayett, William. Display and Exhibit Handbook. Van Nostrand-Reinhold, 1967. $7.50.

This cheerfully written text explains in depth the many fine points of the art of display.

Holman, William R. Library Publications. Roger Beachman, 1965. $45.00.

The book is itself a beautiful example of fine printing.

In turn, it supplies the reader with extensive information on how to produce a really outstanding piece of printed material. This includes paper selection, typography, working with printers, and choosing the method of reproduction. Samples of booklists and flyers are pocketed in the text. Unless you are really affluent, probably better take a look at this volume at a nearby rich neighbor. You may, of course, be tempted beyond your strength.

Jacobs, Herbert. Practical Publicity: A Handbook for Public and Private Workers. McGraw-Hill, 1964. $7.50.

Specifics about publicity techniques with concrete examples. Good chapter on how to handle adverse publicity. Focused mainly on newspapers, but some radio and TV information. A likely book for small libraries.

BASIC STRATEGIES FOR IMPROVING GRAPHIC COMMUNICATIONS

Prepared by: David M. Pesanelli

Someone in a library organization must take the responsibility for giving information a hierarchy that will be reflected in the design of any given graphic unit. Whether the designer/artist or librarian assumes this task is unimportant as long as it is understood as a necessity for clear communications. This is true whether the piece is a throw-away flyer with a twenty-four hour lifetime or a book list issued monthly. A ranking of information reflected by the graphic design is essential toward making any graphic unit "approachable." The audience should never feel confused or overwhelmed by the necessity of extracting the information, in a tedious fashion, from the graphic unit.

Graphic design of printed pieces should be simple in the utilization of typography. Many typefaces and typeface sizes on a page enormously complicates reading for the audience both in terms of absorbing content and scanning information.

Illustration and symbols should relate clearly to content. Because it takes a great deal of time to produce beautiful drawings and illustrations, and constraints related to library communication and schedule requirements preclude the development of fine illustration, source material should be utilized. Images photostated or otherwise reproduced directly from books could become the art utilized on posters and flyers.

Standarization of typefaces, paper sizes and the graphic grid would lead to more coherent communications as well as becoming the basis for great economies in purchasing. Standardization is not the prime basis for an organization image but it can help to provide some of the communications benefits that result from the indepth development of an identity.

An approach that may be helpful toward developing standardization is to do a "pinup" of the past year's graphic output, by category, and to review it. The purpose of standardization is not to preclude creativity but rather to support it. Consistent utilization of some elements, such as an identity and typography, frees the designer/artist to concentrate on the specific message to be delivered.

From the discussion that took place, it would seem as though there is a need for the development of a degree of uniformity regarding library graphic materials. Fixed decisions for each type of graphic piece, perhaps regarding paper size, a design grid and possibly even type style would preclude "re-inventing the wheel" on each assignment totally. This partial standardization would essentially free the designer/artist's time in order that he or she might be creative, perhaps in the areas of color and imagery.

Developing an overview regarding standardization could also be the means for realizing some economic advantages in the ordering of materials and printing. This would then allow for the purchase of better papers or occasionally the utilization of more elaborate techniques.

Production/printing personnel should not be caught at the end of a project's total time-frame with a tight production schedule. If this is a constant situation, it is indicative of a lack of graphics projects overview and planning. The above-mentioned standardization would alleviate this condition somewhat but a significant breakthrough can only come from close internal communications about mutual problems between librarians and design/production staff members.

The videotape systems most libraries possess could be utilized as a medium for orienting the library audience to services and programs. Programs could be prepared internally, the scope of which might include general topics, such as the utilization of the catalogue, to specific areas of concern, such as the content of esoteric collections. Preparation of storyboards will be required to assure a coherent production.

COG Library Seminar -- Sources

There are a number of materials and components that could be helpful in supporting library communications.

1. Exhibit structure components
   Abstracta tubes and connectors for variable modular displays.

   Source: Abstracta Structures, Inc.
   101 Park Ave.
   New York, New York 10017

2. Typography
   Rub-down typography for titles and heads -- Presstype.
   Vinyl, die-cut typography for signage -- Letrasign.

   Source: Visual Systems, Inc.
   1727 Eye Street, N.W.
   Washington, D.C. 20036

3. Signage
Plexiglas and other plastics for signage surfaces.

Source: Read Plastics
12331 Wilkins Ave.
Rockville, Maryland 20852

COG Library Seminar -- Bibliography

As an alternative to design books with a heavy concentration on theory, it might be more productive to subscribe to the best graphics magazines and their annuals, as a means of providing exposure to a high quality level of work. Some of the following magazines may already be in a library's inventory of periodicals.

Graphis

The Graphis Press
Durfourstrasse 107
CH-8008
Zurich, Switzerland $39.00/year

Communication Arts Magazine

P. O. Box 10300
410 Sherman Avenue
Pala Alto, California
94303 $22.00/year

APPENDIX C

PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION

February 10, 11, 1976

OBJECTIVE	1. To increase library effectiveness through improved knowledge of personnel administration by participating staff members 2. To increase personnel office through increased knowledge and understanding of libraries 3. To develop goals and strategies for solutions in problem areas identified by participants 4. To promote interaction among libraries and between librarians and personnel specialists 5. To disseminate information and skills through participants to other library and personnel staff members
DISCUSSION TOPICS	Dealing with problem employees Unionization Employee advancement Affirmative Action Management issues
MODE	Participatory planning mode involving inventorying and prioritizing issues, developing issues statements, resolving issues and sharing results in both small and full group exercises. Outline Pg. 124-125
INSTRUCTORS	A team of two private consultants Mr. Arnold Dahlke BDM Corporation Tysons Corners, Virginia Mr. Steve Maimon BDM Corporation Tysons Corners, Virginia

PARTICIPANTS	2 school librarians 7 public librarians 5 academic librarians 6 personnel specialists
STRENGTHS	Diversity of participant make-up Informality Flexibility
WEAKNESSES	Failure to include background information Length of the course, felt by many to be too short Failure to conduct a follow-up course
OUTCOMES	Changes in titles and class specification Revision of recreational procedures Increased communication with personnel Departments and line supervisors
DOCUMENTS	Issues statements on Library Personnel Administration Pg. 126-133

PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION

Participatory Planning Mode

Morning Session

I. Orientation to Workshop Tasks (P)

- Overview of the workshop
- Role of the facilitators
- Role of the participants

II. Inventorying the Issues (I)

- Individual participants, using a separate index card for each item, will list as many issues (problems) as they would like to see discussed.
- Then they will be asked to sort those cards and rank them in order of importance.

III. Reducing and Prioritizing the Issues

- The results of the individual "brainstorming" will be pulled together as one group list, which will then be numbered for reference.
- Each participant, using the ISSUE RANKING form, will rank each issue according to its importance to him or her and rate issues according to individual "expertise."

IV. Developing Issues Statements (S)

- The group will be divided into triads and each triad will develop a detailed statement (definition) of each of a subset of issues, using the ISSUE STATEMENT form. One member from each triad will be responsible for filling out the form including numbering the questions raised for each issue.
- Facilitators will divide up the issues into three logical sets and assign participants for the small group sessions to follow.

V. Orientation and Assignments to Task Groups (P)

- Issues Statement will be collected.
- Participants will be assigned to one of three task groups according to the decisions made in #IV. above.
- Participants will be given an orientation to the next small group session.

LUNCH

Afternoon Session:

VI. Resolving the Issues (S)

- In each of the three groups the goal will be to address the general problem by answering the specific questions for each issue.

VII. Adjournment

- Participants will be brought together for the purpose of collecting the information generated during the afternoon so that it can be duplicated in the evening in time for the next morning's session.

February 11, 1976

Morning Session:

VIII. Sharing Issue Resolution (P)

- The three task groups of the previous afternoon will share the results of their work with the other participants, who will suggest modifications, deletions, additions.

Afternoon Session:

IX. Informal Group Discussion

P = plenary session
S = small group session
I = individual activity

ISSUES STATEMENTS ON LIBRARY PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION

February, 1976

A. ISSUE -- DEALING WITH THE PROBLEM EMPLOYEE:

Arranging contingencies so as to minimize dissention, low morale, and breakdown of productivity resulting from the problem employee.

Problem employees include:

- -- unsatisfactory performer
- -- chronic absenteeism
- -- alcohol/drugs
- -- poor work habits
- -- negative attitudes
- -- difficulty in getting along with others
- -- theft/petty crimes
- -- organizational sabateur

B. QUESTIONS

1. How do we identify the problem employee?
2. How do we identify problem -- causes?
3. What steps do we go through to deal with the problem?

C. STRATEGIES

1. Identifying employee: any of the types of problem employee listed in (A) above.
2. Identifying causes:
   Job related?
   supervisors?
   co-workers?
   job tasks?
   improper training?
   work environment?
   no chances for advancement?
   salary/benefits?

   Non-job related?
   family related?
   self-concept?
   situational problem (e.g., financial legal, etc.)?
3. Steps to take:
   a. Counseling begins with the immediate supervisor.
      --If the problem is job related, supervisor can attempt to deal with the specific element. Could enlist the help of co-workers, supervisor, and/or personnel department.
      --If non-job related, try to advise, suggest getting outside help, or recommend specific outside professionals.

4. Some don'ts:
   - -- Don't call down employee in front of co-workers.
   - -- Don't threaten unless you can carry out threat. Use threat only as a last resort.
   - -- Don't act on assumptions only. Be sure you have the facts.
   - -- Don't "not listen".
   - -- Don't get personally involved.

A. ISSUE: STAFF DEVELOPMENT:

Arranging resources so as to maximize opportunities for job enrichment through in-service training and continuing education.
By "job enrichment" we mean:
-- productivity
-- variety
-- opportunities for advancement
-- self-actualization
-- etc.

B. QUESTIONS:

1. How do we recognize the need for in-service training and/or continuing education?
2. How do we identify and select such programs?
3. How do we identify and select the employees who will participate?
4. How do we assess the impact of in-service training and continuing education programs?

C. STRATEGIES:

1. Determine needs for in-service training and/or continuing education.
    a. Needs-assessment -- periodic survey of employees.
    b. Problems -- determine needs through identification of problems in the work setting.
2. Identify and select proper programs:

Decisions:

in service	continuing education
do we have personnel resources	what programs are available

budget constraints
time available?
facilities available?

select programs

3. Selecting participants: through the needs-assessment and/or problem identification, specify employees who will participate. Sell them on the program; do not "cram it down their throats."
4. Assessing the impact:
    a. Formal assessment through evaluation, instruments, questionnaires, etc.
    b. Use neutral evaluators if resources allow (possible peers from other libraries).
    c. Observations.
    d. Interviews of trainees and participants.

A. ISSUE: UNIONIZATION -- (a) deciding whether or not to unionize, and (b) if unionized, maximizing the benefits of unions.

B. QUESTIONS:

1. How do you determine where unionization pressures are coming from (internal or external)?
2. Is it better to unionize or select some other approach (e.g., professional association)?
3. What role will the union play?
4. What are the specific facilities offered by the union for resolving problems in these areas:
   - -- hours
   - -- pay scales
   - -- grievances procedures
   - -- benefits
   - -- working conditions
   - -- performance evaluation
5. How does the employee-union-member determine when it it is best to use the union for solving problems, rather than some other approach.

C. STRATEGIES:

1. Make sure that at least 50% of the staff want to unionize.
2. In arriving at your decision, the following issues should be taken into account -- these are all issues that the union will be able to affect.
   - -- salaries
   - -- job reclassification
   - -- retirement
   - -- benefits
   - -- mgmt. and administrative issues
   - -- performance evaluation
3. Keep in mind what the effects will be (on the work environment) if not unionizing.
4. Look at the alternatives (which union) for best fit.
5. Determine which staff members (e.g., supervisors, clerical, etc.) should be involved in (a) the union, (b) as members of the negotiating team?

A. ISSUES: ADVANCEMENT:

B. QUESTIONS:

1. How to deal with difference between what employee wants and what mgr. think he/she deserves?
2. How to create a balance between men/women/skills race/mgmt/staff?
3. How to handle need to retain qualified staff.
4. How to handle need to maintain morale and involvement?
5. How to promote the profession to "assure" funding/ other priorities?
6. How to deal with empire building?
7. How to provide more money/status?
8. How to provide credentials/flexibility -- job security?
9. How to handle belief that profession is passive/ ineffectual/non-dynamic?
10. What to do when managers (some) see advancement of those under them as a threat?
11. What to do when needs/goals are not being communicated?
12. How to handle employees who are not aware of opportunities and constraints and process.

C. STRATEGIES:

1. Unionize/organize.
2. Formalize advancement guidelines/policies/procedures/ career ladders.
3. Formalize recognition-giving.
4. Educate all re. needs -- sensitivity training for decision makers.
5. Develop and advertise a new image.
6. Develop person to person relationships/communications at all levels.
7. Establish staff development programs (internal and external), encourage participation.
8. Establish active interaction and involvement with EEO, AA.
9. Encourage political activism.
10. In library schools, expand curriculum to include managerial skill, etc.
11. Improve credibility/status of library schools.
12. Explore/expand the field -- e.g. mgmt, info. systems/ consulting/automated data banking.
13. Reflecting the needs of personnel in budget submission.
14. Informal advancement -- job enrichment, change titles, responsibility.

A. ISSUE: AFFIRMATIVE ACTION.

B. QUESTIONS:

1. How to develop an effective Affirmative Action Program?

C. STRATEGIES:

1. Get endorsement from agency/department head.
2. Identify needs -- statistically.
3. Establish goals -- statistically.
4. Affix responsibility for implementation to various department heads, administrative officers, personnel officers etc.
5. Establish time-table.
6. Establish reporting requirements
   to whom?
   who compiles/processes/passes reports along?
7. Administrative officer probably should forward recommendations.
8. Obtain response of agency to recommendations in the form of an official document.
9. Submit periodic reports to administrative officers.
10. Widen base of advertising, advertise in minority pubns., contact other assns for lists.
11. Extend deadlines.
12. Bring in at sub-prof. level; promote; build up a cadre of sub-proof. minorities to move up.
13. Pay recruitment officers to travel around to recruit.
14. Recruit at ALA, etc.
15. Refer minorities from predominantly minority/Black etc. pools to other areas -- Exchange.
16. Compile notebook of relevant legislation, guide books, test cases, etc.

A. ISSUE: MANAGEMENT

B. QUESTIONS:

1. Are there policies and procedures concerning job structure?
2. What are the respective roles in the personnel department and the library?
3. Are policies/procedures current, effective, easily changed?
4. Should qualification standards be uniform?

5. How to prepare mgmt. and staff for assuming responsibilities?
6. What is impact of time frames on responsive action?
7. How to develop self-awareness.
8. What governs decision making - incl. organizational constraints?
9. What governs delegation of responsibility and/or authority?

10. How to deal with special groups? (Affirmative Action, Equal Rights, unions)
11. How to open up and establish communication channels? (Person to person)
12. How to employ effective human relations practices in creating positive employees personal practices.
13. How to change attitudes and create environment for positive interactions?
14. How to keep balance between line and staff?
15. How to interface with other organizations and libraries?
16. How to obtain funding? How to cope with reduced funding?
17. Who is authorized to procure money.
18. How to encourage gifts, grants, endowments, etc?
19. Impacts of different types of income on staff allocation?
20. Impact of federally funded people and programs?

C. STRATEGIES:

1. Resolve relationship between classification and career ladders for new hires and longterm staff.
   - -- Structure initial program
   - -- Establish continuing program
2. Establish constant cooperation through communication.
   - -- Regular meetings, telephone calls, memos.
   - -- Open door policy
3. Establish continuing program to effect sensitivity and receptivity to change.
4. Educate mgmt. and staff to seek, assume and participate in responsibility.
5. Establish plans and procedures to avoid "fires".
6. Educate mgmt. to delegate responsibility and authority (continuing process)
7. Educate staff to respond effectively to mgmt.
8. Continuing program to develop mgmt. skills.
9. Staff meetings (ad hoc, and regular) to discuss and resolve substantive issues.
10. Develop inter ("organizational") communication philosophy and procedures and systems.
11. Develop in-service programs and training for interdepartmental orientation and cooperation.
12. Develop contingency plans.
13. Participation of staff in budget development.
14. Educate "funding", procurement specialists.
15. Establish capability to prepare funding proposals.
16. Establish information dissemination program re. system resources.
17. Establish communication networks to share information on funding, administration, etc. between different libraries and other organizations.
18. Assess alternative approaches to maximize limited resources (all areas), e.g., cooperatives -- problem is territoriality of individual administrators.

APPENDIX D

CONSUMER PROTECTION INFORMATION
March 2, 3, 1976

OBJECTIVES	1. To increase library effectiveness through improved knowledge of consumer information resources and services by participating staff members. 2. To increase consumer agency effectiveness through increased knowledge of library information resources and services by participating staff members. 3. To develop goals and strategies for solutions to problem areas identified by participants. 4. To promote interaction among libraries and between librarians and consumer specialists. 5. To disseminate knowledge and skills through workshop participants to other library and consumer agency staff members.
LECTURE TOPICS	Local sources of consumer information and services Areas of cooperation between consumer agencies and librarians
MATERIALS	Handouts relating to local consumer services furnished by participating consumer agencies
MODE	Forum mode involving one day of formal presentation and one of participatory problem solving.
PANELISTS	3 members of print and broadcast media 5 representatives of local consumer agencies

PANELISTS (Cont'd)

Ms. Meredith Fernstrom
Education Specialist
Consumer Affairs Office
District of Columbia Government
Washington, D.C. 20005

Ms. Mary Greeley
WTOP Channel 9
4001 Brandywine Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Ms. Nellie Miller
Montgomery County Office of
Consumer Affairs
24 South Perry Street
Rockville, Maryland 20850

Mr. J. N. Horrocks
Public Citizen
1200 15th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

Mr. Richard Gutierrez
Ayuda Para El Consumidor
1736 Columbia Road, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20009

Mr. Charles Hammond
Executive Director
Arlington County
Office of Consumer Affairs
2049 Virginia Avenue,S.E.
Washington, D.C.

Ms. Bailey Morris
Washington-Star News
225 Virginai Avenue, S.E.
Washington, D.C.

Ms. Lea Thompson
WRC - TV 4
4001 Nebraska Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

PARTICIPANTS

9 public librarians
9 consumer specialists

STRENGTHS	Material presented by panels Interdisciplinary make-up of participants
WEAKNESSES	Participant seminar Impracticality of problem solving strategies developed Low attendance by consumer specialists at group seminar
OUTCOMES	Joint review of consumer films Development of consumer education grant proposal Greater cooperation between consumer agencies and librarians
DOCUMENTS	Issues statement on Consumer Protection Information Pg. 137-145

ISSUES STATEMENTS ON CONSUMER PROTECTION INFORMATION

March, 1976

Group 1 - Coordination

We are concerned because:

1. There is a lack of coordination among various consumer-oriented groups that results in the underutilization of existing resources and in the duplication of efforts.

2. There is no systematic channel for communication and exchange of information among consumer protection agencies, community action groups, news media and libraries.

3. There is a lack of recognition of the role of libraries in the dissemination of consumer survival information.

Our goals are:

1. To form a metropolitan network composed of representatives of consumer protection agencies, community action groups, news media and libraries for exchange of consumer/investigative data.

2. To form a central data base available to all consumer-concerned groups.

3. To achieve greater responsiveness on the part of libraries toward consumer needs by incorporating those needs into services/programming and making consumer agencies aware of the services.

GROUP 1 -

GOAL #1

1. COG should establish a Task Force to survey agencies and establish guidelines for the formation of a Metropolitan Consumer Protection Network

2. This task force would be charged with determining (a) the types of information that each agency could contribute, (b) by degree of agency commitment to sharing information resources and contacts, and (c) any legal restraints

3. Initial efforts of network. A. Publication of a quarterly network report summarizing activities of each agency (trends in consumer inquiries and complaints, warnings, titles of new publications, pending legislation).
B. Generation of model consumer legislation

GOAL #2

Consumer Data Base

1. Seek funding for computer data base, modeled after LEAA arrest records

2. Use standardized jurisdictional complaint forms, converted into machine readable form

3. Develop method for input and update

GOAL #3

1. Approach library school facilities for aid in establishing curricula for consumer education for librarians and consumer agency representatives

2. Library/Consumer Agency Workshops to make each more aware of the activities and available services of the others

3. Establishment of cooperative consumer outreach programs, libraries in conjunction with consumer agencies and community action groups

Group 2 - Techniques and Materials

We are concerned because:

1. There is no comprehensive metropolitan area community services/consumer information directory at the present time... nor do we see any plans for one as far as we know.

2. There is a need for comprehensive and readily accessible information on both new and old products and on local services.

3. There is a need for central coordination for the acquisition and distribution to libraries of free and inexpensive materials in the consumer area.

4. There is a need for the consumer to understand the implications of existing laws and proposed legislation as they apply to the consumer.

Our goals are:

1. To produce a comprehensive, metropolitan area community services/consumer information directory.

2. To have available in the libraries updated comprehensive information on both products (old and new) and local services.

3. To have a central resource center for the acquisition and distribution to libraries of free and inexpensive materials.

4. To have readily available either written or oral interpretations of existing laws and proposed legislation as they apply to the consumer.

RECOMMENDATIONS

GROUP 2-

GOAL #1

1. Get COG's Librarians' Technical Committee and the COG Consumer Protection Technical Committee to advocate...
2. That COG obtain a grant from the Federal government to initially organize and design a project to produce the directory in either microfilm or hard copy for use in the metropolitan area. (Later funding could come from individual jurisdictions to keep the directory as an on-going program)
3. The project would be controlled by a central resource center (such as COG who would have responsibility for distribution
4. Inputs to the project would come from (a) consumer agencies (b) COG committees (c) Metropolitan libraries, and (d) county referral systems
5. The directory will directly benefit consumers as well as all groups inputting to the project

GOAL #2

No solutions developed

GOAL #3

1. To get the COG Librarians' Technical committee and Consumer Protection Technical Committee to advocate...
2. That COG obtain a grant to establish a central resources center for the acquisition and distribution of these materials to:
    - a) Consumer agencies
    - b) Metropolitan libraries
    - c) COG Consumer Protection Technical Committee
    - d) County referral system
    - e) Varied local consumer groups

GOAL #3 (continued)

3. This center would be controlled by a group such as COG

4. All consumers and above groups would benefit from the establishment of this center

GOAL #4

1. Advocated by COG Consumer Protection Technical Committee

2. Consumer agency personnel, aided by local law students, shall identify legal problem areas, interpret existing laws and proposed legislation in these areas, and make information available in print and verbally to:

    a) Consumers

    b) Metropolitan libraries

    c) Consumer groups

3. Controlled by metropolitan consumer agencies on an individual agency basis. Pertinent information may be shared among all agencies

    Additional funding probably not necessary unless printing budget not sufficient

CONSUMER PROTECTION WORKSHOP

Group 3 - Reaching Consumer

We are concerned because:

1. The American in his role as a consumer is not aware that she/he has rights as well as obligations. While she/he is contributing to the sustinance of the economy by consuming, the producer/manufacturer is also obligated to sustain the economy by satisfying and serving the consumer. The interaction of obligations and rights (between the two) should be equally shared. The average consumer is not aware that she/he has rights and therefore is not motivated to seek help or assert and help himself/herself. Also if motivated to act, she/he does not know how to do so.
2. Community agencies and OCS's in particular are not reaching all the consumers.

Our goals are:

1. To make the consumer more aware of the total scope of his/her role as a consumer, i.e. that it encompasses rights as well as obligations.
2. To motivate the consumer to use what resources are available to him/her.
3. To motivate the consumer to participate in (have impact on) the process of creating new market goods and assistance - resources at all levels from decision-making to delivery.
4. To get OCA's etc. to put themselves "in the consumer's place" and design all their efforts with that in mind --- and to get OCA's etc. to act instead of react by anticipating what could occur.

RECOMMENDATIONS

GROUP 3

I. Techniques and Strategies

1. Establish 'storefront' branches at OCA's and roving mobile units in local communities. Consumer specialists can sit in on bookmobiles to get into low-income communities
2. Include printed material for all reading levels
3. Use non-print media---cassettes, video tapes, cartoons etc. Libraries can consult with consumer specialists to determine which materials, print and non-print, to buy
4. Train civic leaders, educators, ministers, etc. to take our message to their constituencies
5. Interpret laws into everyday language
6. Utilize various degrees of educational messages (spots, in-depth)
7. Speak the language of the segment of the public you want to reach. The Spanish consumer agency is willing to translate and disseminate library publications
8. Use volunteers to distribute leaflets and knock on doors to reach the un-motivated and non-mobile public (shut-ins etc.)
9. Bring programs to institutions. This could be tied in with already established library outreach programs
10. Have displays (produced by libraries and consumer agencies) and information available in libraries
11. Use of speakers and personal contacts. Libraries can get recommended speakers from consumer affairs offices
12. Make our programs/resources/people a part of the existing communities and facilities (community action centers, recreation centers, adult education centers, etc.)

GROUP 3 (continued)

13. Use of materials which relate specific messages for specific communities as well as general messages for the mass public.

II. Advocates

1. Some metropolitanwide agency like COG, Office of Consumer Affairs, Nader, etc.
2. OCA administrative heads

III. Actors

1. Library and OCA administrators, librarians, consumer education and project organizers, consumer investigators, consumer lawyers, community volunteers

IV. Affected Persons

1. Consumer and OCA role (more from react to act)

V. Control

1. Agencies - local and metropolitan

VI. Funding and resources

1. City/county/and federal grants

VII. How to tap into funding

1. Submit grant proposals
2. Lobby politicians and administrators
3. Show community support

VIII. Organizational and policy requirements

1. Much closer relationships between OCA's, libraries, and metropolitan agencies - perhaps monthly exchange of ideas through meetings in different areas on a rotating basis
2. OCA's would need to perceive new roles which emphasize prevention and working with consumers more than remedying
3. Libraries need to perceive that not all information comes from books and adjust to outreach instead of having people come to them

GROUP 3 - (continued)

IX. Legislation

None

X. When?

1. Metropolitan area task force begin to get their personnel and administrators together
2. Work in community which did not need grant money, probably would not be implemented before 6 months
3. Grant-funded aspects probably over year at the earliest

PLANNING AND BUDGETING

April 6, 7, 8, 1976

OBJECTIVES

1. To increase library effectiveness through improved knowledge of techniques of planning, budgeting and grant solicitation.
2. To increase individual competencies in specific areas:
    a. Use of regional data in planning
    b. Program evaluation
    c. Budgeting methods and techniques
    d. Grant solicitation from federal agencies.
    e. Grant solicitation from private foundations.
3. To disseminate information through participants to other library staff members (informal communication, workshop replication, etc.)
4. To promote interaction among librarians and between librarians and other professionals.

LECTURE TOPICS

Libraries and regional planning
Use of regional data in program planning
Program evaluation
The budgeting process
Program budgeting
Line-item budgeting
Zero-base budgeting
Applying for grants from the Federal government
Applying for grants from Private Foundations

MATERIALS

If you are writing your first proposal available from Department of Health Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Office of Consumers' Education Washington, D.C.

News releases from the National Endowment for the Humanities, Washington, D.C. 20506

Annual reports of local foundations

"Rules and Regulations" of the Department of Health Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Library Research and Demonstration Higher Education Act Title II V. Available in Federal Register, Vol 39 50 97, Friday, May 17, 1974 pages 7503-17746

" FY Abstracts" of the Library Research and demonstration Br. Higher Education Act Title II-B Available from the Department of HEW, office of Education, Library Research and Demonstration, BR. 400 Md. Ave. SW, ROB3, Rm 3319C Washington, D.C. 20202

"Recent Development of the Council on Library Resources, Inc."

"Council on Library Resources, Inc., Nineteenth annual Report, 1975"

Both available from the Council on Library Resources One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036

"What Makes a Good Proposal?" by F. Lee Jacquette and Barbara L. Jacquette available from the Foundation Center, 888 Seventh Ave. New York, N.Y. 10019

Bibliography
Pg. 151-153

MODE

Primarily lecture and panel discussion

INSTRUCTORS

6 panelists and lecturers from federal and private funding agencies
1 program evaluation expert from local government
1 budgeting expert from the federal government
2 planning experts from COG

Ms. Margo Brinkley
Librarian
Foundation Center
1001 Connecticut Ave., NW
Washington, D. C. 20036
347-1400

Mr. George Chapman
Director of Planning Coordination
Metropolitan Washington Council of Government
1225 Connecticut Ave., NW
Washington, D. C. 20036
223-6800

Ms. Thelma Eichman
Strong Foundation
1625 I Street, NW
Washington, D. C. 20006
331-1619

Mr. Jeffrey Field
Public Programs
National Endowment for the Humanities
806 15th Street, NW
Washington, D. C. 20506
382-7465

Mr. Sam Finz, Director
Office of Research Statistics
County of Fairfax
4100 Chain Bridge Rd.
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
691-3380

Ms. Barrie Frazier
Redskin Foundation
Suite 1005
5454 Wisconsin Ave.
Chevy Chase, Maryland 20015
654-7774

INSTRUCTORS (continued)

Ms. Nancy Gwinn
Council on Library Resources
1 Dupont Circle
Washington, D. C. 20036
296-4757

Mr. Paul Janaske
Chief Research & Demonstration Branch
Office of Library and Learning Resources, Room 5909
U.S. Office of Education
7th & D Street, SW
Washington, D. C. 20202
245-2798

Mr. John E. Murphy
Director of Financial Management Training
U.S. Civil Service Commission
Bureau of Training
Attention: TOS
1900 E Street, NW
Washington, D. C. 20415
632-5600

Mr. Robert Dunphy
Chief, Research and Analysis
Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
1225 Connecticut Ave., NW
Washington, D. C. 20036
223-6800

PARTICIPANTS

16 academic librarians
10 public librarians
4 special librarians

STRENGTHS

Quality and appropriateness of grantsmanship component
Quality and appropriateness of program evaluation component

WEAKNESSES

Attempted to include too much in the Non-participatory format
Inappropriateness of regional planning component

DOCUMENTS

The Use of Program Evaluation Methodology in the Fairfax County Public Library System
Pg. 154-168

BIBLIOGRAPHY

REGIONAL PLANNING

Alden, J. and R. Morgan. *Regional Planning, a comprehensive view*. New York: Halsted Press, 1974, 364;.

Kuklinski, Antoni. *Regional information and regional planning*. Paris: Mouton, 1974, 389p. (United National Research Institute for Social Development. Regional planning, Vol. 6).

McAllister, Donald M. *Equity and efficiency in public facility locations*. Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles, School of Architecture and Urban Planning, 1974,25p.

Williams, Anne S. and William R. Lassey. *Regional planning and development: organization and strategies*. Bozeman: Montana State University, Center for Interdisciplinary Studies in cooperation with the Department of Sociology and Agricultural Experiment Station, 1973, 127p.

PROGRAM EVALUATION

Harry, Hatry and Winnie Fisk. *Practical Program Evaluation for State and Local Governments*, Washington, D.C., Urban Institute.

GRANT SOLICITATION - FEDERAL

Crawford, Jack and Cathy Kielsmeier. *Proposal Writing*. A Continuing education book. Corvallis, Oregon, Oregon State University, 1970.

Kush, Gary *Introduction to Proposal Writing*: *A Self Instructional Course*. Look Christian Training School Tempu, Arizona.

Office of Management and Budget, Executive office of the President *Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance*. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 10th Ed. May 1976.

GRANT SOLICITATION - PRIVATE

The Bread Game: The Realities of Foundation Fund-Raising. Revised edition, 1974. 96p. Order from Glide Publications, 330 Ellis Street, San Francisco, California 94162. $2.95.

A Comprehensive Guide to Successful Grantsmanship, by William J. Hill. Revised edition 1972. Looseleaf, Order from Grant Development Institute, 2140 South Holly, Denver, Colorado 80222. $24.00

Dermer, Joseph, Editor. America's Most Successful Fund Raising Letters. 1976. 141p. Order from Public Service Material Center, 355 Lexington Avenue, New York, New York 10017. $12.75.

Dermer, Joseph, Editor. How to Get Your Fair Share of Foundation Grants. 1973. 143p. Order from Public Service Materials Center, 355 Lexington Avenue, New York, New York 10017. $12.00.

Dermer, Joseph. How to Write Successful Foundation Presentations. 1972. 80p. Order from Public Service Materials Center, 355 Lexington Avenue, New York, New York 10017. $8.95.

Dermer, Joseph. The New How to Raise Funds from Foundations. 1975. 95p. Order from Public Service Materials Center, 355 Lexington Avenue, New York, New York 10017. $8.95.

FRI Foundations Handbook. Edited by Jane Williams. 1975. 149p. Order from the Fund Raising Institute, Plymouth Meeting, Pennsylvania 19462. $20.00

Grant Development Digest. Fall 1972 - Order from Grant Development Institute, 2140 South Holly, Denver, Colorado 80222. $10.00

The Grantsman Quarterly Journal. Vol. 1, no. 1 - Spring 1972 - Order from Grantsman, Inc., 950 6th Street, Pine City, Minnesota 55063. $24.00.

Grantsmanship Center News. Vol. 1, no. 1 - September 1973 - Order from the Grantsmanship Center, 1015 West Olympic Blvd., Los Angeles, California 90015. $15.00

Grantsmanship: Money and How to Get It. Edited by Jon S. Greene, 1973. 27;. Order from Academic Media, 32 Lincoln Avenue, Orange, New Jersey 07050. $5.00

Hill, William J. Grant Writing Made Easy, 1973. 12p. Order from Grant Development Institute, 2140 South Holly, Denver, Colorado 80222. $3.50

Hillman, Howard & Karin Abarbanel. The Art of Winning Foundation Grants. 1975. 188p. Order from the Vanguard Press, Inc., 424 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10017. $6.95.

The KRC Handbook of Fund Raising Strategy and Tactics. Edited by Joseph A. Ecciesine. 1972. 313p. Order from KRC Associates, 105 Wagner Avenue, Mamaroneck, New York. 10543. $32.00

Knittle, Fred D. *How to Obtain Foundation Grants.* 1972. 344p. Order from R. L. Houts Associates, Inc., 3960 Wilshire Blvd., Los Angeles, California 90010. $75.00.

Looking for a Grant: A Kit for Groups Seeking Financial Assistance. (1975). Order from Publications Office Women's Bureau, Department of Labor, Washington, D.C. 20210. No charge.

MacIntyre, Michael. *How to Write a Proposal.* 1971. 55p. Order from Volt Information Sciences, Inc., 1221 Avenue of the Americas, New York, New York 10013. $3.95.

Mirkin, Howard R. *The Complete Fund Raising Guide*. 1972. 159p. Order from Public Service Materials Center, 355 Lexington Avenue, New York, New York 10017. $12.50.

The 1976-77 Survey of Grant-Making Foundations with Assets of over $1,000,000 or Grants of over $200,000. 1976. 62p. Order from Public Service Materials Center, 355 Lexington Avenue, New York, New York 10017. $8.50.

Proposal Planning and Development; Papers from a Seminar for Fund Raisers and Administrators in Higher Education. 1971. 61p. Order from Cooperative College Development Program, Phelps-Stokes Fund, 22 East 54th Street, New York, New York 10022. $1.00.

The Proposal Writer's Swipe File. Edited by Jean Brodsky. 1973. 135p. Order from Taft Products, Inc., 1000 Vermont Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005. $5.50.

User's Guide to Funding Resources. 1975. 980p. Order from Human Resources Network, 2010 Chancellor Street, Philadelphia Pennsylvania 19103. $42.00.

White, Virginia P. *Grants; How to Find Out About Them and What to do Next*. 1975. 354p. Order from Plenum Press, 227 17th Street, New York, New York 10011. $19.50.

THE USE OF PROGRAM EVALUATION METHODOLOGY IN THE FAIRFAX COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY SYSTEM

INTRODUCTION

In an effort to aid the budget and planning decision-making process, Fairfax County developed and implemented a program evaluation methodology - the Productivity Program. The Productivity Program was responsible for establishing goals, objectives, and measures of effectiveness for all County agencies, and at the same time charged with developing a mechanism by which the County Executive could be made aware of the agencies' progress in meeting these goals and objectives. Prior to the implementation of the Program, there existed no means of data collection which could be used to indicate or measure the performance of a given agency or measure the effectiveness of a given program.

The Productivity Program not only plays an integral part in the budget and planning process, i.e. providing a means to evaluate budgetry and manpower requests in light of present levels of performance, it also aids in improving the level of effectiveness of services to the citizens of the County, oftentimes at a reduction in cost to the citizens.

MEASUREMENT SYSTEM

The mechanism devised to monitor agency activities is the Monthly Report to the County Executive. This report acts as the vehicle for the collection of data and ultimately supports evaluation. The first and most important step in preparing the Monthly Report was the establishment of goals, objectives, and measures of effectiveness for every County agency. This was accomplished through the joint coordination efforts between the Fairfax County Office of Research and Statistics and the agency for whom they were developed. In conjunction with the establishment of the goals, objectives, and measures of effectiveness, procedures for the collection and recordation of data were also formulated; data which was later to be summarized and analyzed by the Office of Research and Statistics to be used in the evaluation of agency productivity. The statistical data contained in the Monthly Report are relative to current activities, previous month's activities, and previous year's activities, by program for a given agency. An example of the format used in the collection of the statistical data is shown on Chart I. On a monthly basis these statistics are analyzed, thus the agency's progress is measured and evaluated in terms of delivery of services. Significant occurrences, management issues, and recommendations are then communicated to the County Executive.

CHART I

Table________

NUMBER	MEASURE OF EFFECTIVENESS	NOTE	CURRENT FISCAL YEAR BY MONTH												MONTHLY DATA					YEAR TO DATE DATA					CURRENT YR TARGET
															%DIF FROM LAST MO	SAME MO LAST YR		TARGET		THIS YEAR	LAST YEAR		TARGET		
			J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J		AMT	% DIF	AMT	% MET		AMT	% DIF	AMT	% MET	

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS

An example of this management tool as it relates to the Fairfax County Public Library is shown below. The library's functions have been broken down (a joint effort between the staffs of the Office of Research and Statistics and the Fairfax County Public Library) to detail each area of activity in terms of goals, objectives, and measures of effectiveness.

Overall Goal

To ensure free public library service of high quality and efficiency for the citizens of Fairfax County.

Goal 1

To provide a coordinated network of Library facilities where materials and reliable information are accessible to all residents.

Objective 1

To provide a regional library within 15 minutes driving time and a satellite library within 10 minutes driving time of a least 90 percent of the population.

Measures of Effectiveness

- Percent of service area population that are registrants.
- Percent of persons within 15 minutes driving time of a regional library or 10 minutes driving time of a satellite library.

Objective 2

To provide on-site parking adequate for handling peak periods of library usage and meetings scheduled in the meeting rooms.

Measures of Effectiveness

- Number of complaints about inadequate parking received by branch.
- Percent of non-users giving lack of parking as reason for non-use.
- Number of libraries with inadequate parking, based on library standards.
- Ratio of parking spaces to population and/or registrants.
- Percentage of total usable square footage of building in accordance with appropriate County Zoning Ordinances.

Objective 3
To provide, in each category of library, (satellite and regional), seating and shelving capacity of at least the level specified by the State Library Board, and other facilities that will ensure a comfortable reading and working environment for patrons and staff.

Measures of Effectiveness
- Seating capacity of library as a percent of state requirement.
- Shelving capacity of library as a percent of state requirement.
- Ratio of shelving needs to circulation and book stock.
- Ratio of available seating to circulation and book stock.

Objective 4
To provide meeting rooms for library and community uses.

Measures of Effectiveness
- Percentage of available time meeting rooms are utilized, total and branch.
- Number of groups using library facilities total and by branch.
- Number in audiences, total and by branch.

Objective 5
To provide safe and comfortable bookmobiles to meet the library needs of the population beyond 10 minutes driving time to a satellite library and to serve elements of the population having special need.

Measures of Effectiveness
- Number of staff visits outside of library.
- Number of people seen on visits.
- Circulation on outreach visits.

Goal 2
To ensure the collection, preservation, and availability of library materials that should be acquired by the library system.

Objective 1
To determine the types and quantities of materials that should be acquired by the library system.

Measures of Effectiveness

- Percentage of books requested but not available per branch by type and month.
- Percentage change in circulation per branch by month.

Objective 2

To assure that the full range of resources of significance are available on a timely basis. Such resources include books for young people and adults, financial services, reference services, instrumental and vocal music scores, 16mm sound films, musical and spoken recordings, magazines, talking books, projected books, pamphlets, microfilm, large print books, and newspapers.

Measures of Effectiveness

- Percentage of total number of new titles published annually (as tabulated by Publishers Weekly Annual Survey) selected for evaluation by Fairfax County.
- Percentage of new titles evaluated that are actually acquired.
- Ratio of number of copies to number of titles.
- Percentage of total titles evaluated that have publication dates of five or ten or more years.
- Change in the total number of gift books added to collection.
- Percentage of evaluated gift books added to collection.
- Percentage of change in the number of reviews searched.
- Average time between selection of a title and receipt of the same in the Technical Processing Division.
- Average time from receipt in technical processing to distribution to public service outlets.
- Ratio of fiction to non-fiction titles evaluated and added.
- Percentage of total titles added that are reference.

Objective 3

To process library materials so that they are available as soon as they are acquired.

Measures of Effectiveness

- Average time elapsed from time of consideration to distribution of library materials.
- Number of library materials processed.

Goal 3

To provide high quality and efficient library services to users and reduce the number of library non-users.

Objective 1
To provide the staff necessary for full utilization of the library's resources and services.

Measures of Effectiveness
- Ratio of staff to circulation, by branch.

Objective 2
To ensure that library hours of service are such that maximum use can be made of the facilities to satisfy a majority of the citizens.

Measures of Effectiveness
- Percent of users satisfied with library hours, by branch.
- Percent of non-users who give hours of service as reason for non-use.

Objective 3
To answer all reference inquiries accurately and promptly and to assist those engaged in research.

Measures of Effectiveness
- Number of information questions received frcm public.

Objective 4
To use inter-library exchange of materials with other libraries.

Measures of Effectiveness
- Percent of requested titles that were supplied by the Fairfax County Public Library.
- Ratio of number of titles requested from the Fairfax County Public Library to the number requested by the Fairfax County Public Library.
- Number of titles requested from the Fairfax County Public Library .
- Number of titles requested by the Fairfax County Public Library from other libraries.

Goal 4
To promote library-oriented activities and events.

Objective 1
To provide a variety of films and stories for children and adults of the County every week in all library meeting rooms.

Measures of Effectiveness

- Number of County publications retained by Fairfax County Public Library.

Objective 5

To provide records management and archival direction to all County agencies.

Measures of Effectiveness

- Annual percentage change in man-years of efforts directly related to records management in archival program in each County agency and the library records and management and archival section.

CHART II

COMPARISON OF IDENTIFIED MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS AND ACTUAL DATA ELEMENTS COLLECTED

Measures of Effectiveness

1) Percent of service area population that are registarnts.

2) Percent of persons within 15 minutes driving time of a regional library or 10 minutes driving time of a satellite library.

3) Number of complaints about inadequate parking received by branch.

4) Percent of non-users giving lack of parking as reason for non-use.

5) Number of libraries with inadequate parking, based on library standards.

6) Ratio of parking spaces to population and/or registrants.

7) Percentage of total usable square footage of building site devoted to parking spaces.

8) Ratio of parking spaces to square footage of building in accordance with appropriate County Zoning Ordinances.

9) Seating capacity of library as a percent of state requirement.

10) Shelving capacity of library as a percent of state requirement.

11) Ratio of shelving needs to circulation and book stock.

12) Percentage of available time meeting rooms are utilized, total and branch.

13) Number of groups using library facilities total and by branch.

14) Number in audiences, total and by branch.

15) Number of staff visits outside of library.

16) Number of people seen on visits.

17) Circulation on outreach visits.

Chart II (continued)

18) Percentage of books requested but not available per branch by type and month.

19) Percentage change in circulation per branch by month.

20) Percentage of total number of new titles published annually (as tabulated by Publishers Weekly Annual Survey) selected for evaluation by Fairfax County.

21) Percentage of new titles evaluated that are actually acquired.

22) Ratio of number copies to number of titles.

23) Percentage of total titles evaluated that have publication dates of five or ten or more years.

24) Change in the total number of gift books added to collection.

25) Percentage of evaluated gift books added to collection.

26) Percentage change in number of reviews searched.

27) Average time between selection of a title and receipt of the same in the Technical Processing Division.

28) Average time from receipt in technical processing to distribution to public service outlets.

29) Ratio of fiction to non-fiction titles evaluated and added.

30) Percentage of total titles added that are referenced.

31) Average time elapsed from time of consideration to distribution of library materials.

32) Number of library materials processed.

33) Ratio of staff to circulation, by branch.

34) Percent of users satisfied with library hours, by branch.

35) Percent of non-users who give hours of service as reason for non-use.

36) Number of information questions received from public.

37) Percent of requested titles that were supplied by the Fairfax County Public Library.

Chart II (continued)

38) Ratio of number of titles requested from the Fairfax County Public Library to the number requested by the Fairfax County Public Library.

39) Number of titles requested from the Fairfax County Public Library from other libraries.

40) Number of titles requested by the Fairfax County Public Library from other libraries.

41) Monthly change in total staff hours spent per week for presentation of films and stories.

42) Percentage change in the number of library sponsored film program by branch.

43) Percentage change in audience size in these film programs.

44) Monthly change in number of library sponsored programs.

45) Monthly change in total attendance at library sponsored programs.

46) Number of visits by library staff to organizations, schools, et cetera.

47) Number of County publications retained by the Fairfax County Public Library.

48) Annual percentage change in man-years of effort directly related to records management in archival program in each County agency and the library records and management and archival section.

Actual Data Elements Collected

a) Circulation of materials per capita

b) Number of registered borrowers per capita

c) Library building use by citizens, (12 and #13)
    - number of group uses
    - number in audiences

d) Percent of time meeting room used, amount of time available for use (#12)

e) Number of information questions received from public. (#36)

f) Number of back issue periodicals requested for use by public.

g) Outreach (#14, #15, #16, #44, #45, #46, #47,&#48)
  - number of staff visits outside of library
  - number of people seen on visits
  - circulation on outreach visits

h) Average time elapsed from time of consideration to distribution of library materials (in weeks). (#30)

i) Inter-library loans (#17)
  - number of titles requested from Fairfax County Public Library
  - percent of requested titles that were supplied by Fairfax County Public Library
  - Number of titles requested by Fairfax County Public Library from other libraries

j) Ratio of number of titles requestef from Fairfax County Public Library/number of titles requested by Fairfax County Public Library. (#38)

k) Actual circulation (#18)

l) Registered borrowers (#1)

m) Positions vacant

n) Percent vacant of total authorized

*The ( ) indicate that measure which is associated with the data element.

DATA COLLECTION

The data collection and information processing function is an integral part of program evaluation, for it is these statistics (which are collected on a monthly basis) that are summarized, compared, and analyzed in order to obtain a measure of effectiveness. The viability of a performance evaluation methodology of this type depends on the availability of the required data.

In the case of the Fairfax County Public Library, the information needed to evaluate performance has been identified in conjunction with its goals and objectives. This information is what is referred to as measures of effectiveness, and identified concurrently with the goals and objectives (as listed in the preceding pages). Chart II, which follows, represents those measures of effectiveness identified and those data elements which are actually collected on a monthly basis with regard to library service.

Note that some information is collected which has not been identified as being meaningful in terms of measures of effectiveness. And, in other cases, information which has been identified as being meaningful is not available. For example, figures which relate to the physical location of each branch in terms of accessibility, parking, and distance from their registered borrower are not available for collection. As a result information does not exist for the measures of "percent of persons within 15 minutes driving time of a regional library or 10 minutes driving time of a satellite library" or "number of complaints about inadequate parking received by branch." Also desired, yet not available, is information on times of use of branches. Information of this nature would aid in facility locating planning. The only way possible for data for these measures to be obtained is through a citizen survey. Surveys are not always practical however, because 1) they are time-consuming and costly to administer and 2) the responses do not always yield worthwhile results.

Another reason why there exists data collection problems with regard to certain measures of effectiveness for libraries is the proven utility of circulation information as measures of effectiveness versus quality of service, i.e. type of books desired by users, book use, or kind of responses regarding satisfaction or dissatisfaction in book selection. Circulation statistics will provide information such as "number of registered borrowers per capita" or "number of periodicals requested for use by the public," but cannot provide any measure for types of books desired by user, age group/book selection, or book use.

This data collection problem can be alleviated however, as the evaluation process progresses over time. More and better systems of information and measures are constantly being developed. The Office of Research and Statistics has recently completed a feasibility study for automating library services. A system, if developed, would replace the current library circulation control system with an automated system capable of meeting more extensive control requirements of the libraries. This new system would provide additional information to the library. Chart III indicates that additional information which would be available.

Evaluation

The final step in this program evaluation methodology is the establishment of standards for evaluation. Standards may be defined as targets for a specified level of attainment - results to be expected from a particular program within a pre-determined period of time. For example, a standard in the Fairfax County Public Library is a targeted user rate of 20 groups a month per branch for library building use by groups. Referring to Chart II, all reported figures for "library building use by citizens" and "percent of time meeting room used and amount of time available for use" could then be measured against that target. However, those standards to be considered useful must depend upon whether information can be collected for it.

In some cases, increased or improved activities in a specific area has little or no impact on the agency's overall achievement of goals and objectives, yet this information is reported. For example, the Director may wish to note the implementation of a new accounting procedure or a shift in responsibilities among the clerical staff. In this regard, the Monthly Report includes an "agency notes" section which the Director of the agency uses to explain a variation in reported figures of an event that has occured which did not necessarily hav

CHART III

POTENTIAL INFORMATION AVAILABLE FORM PROPOSED AUTOMATION OF LIBRARY SERVICES

Potential Data Elements Collected

a) Hourly usage of library facilities to help determine manpower allocations. (#2,#33,#37,#38,&#40)*

b) Specific characteristics of users in terms of age, sex, et cetera.

c) Overdue patterns

d) Specific data relating to titles and copies in the system and use of each. (#11,#21,#22,#23,&#32)*

e) Specific data relating volume of patron use. (#1&#34)*

*The ( ) indicate that measure which is associated with the data element.

SUMMARY

Presented in this paper is a description of the program evaluation methodology employed by Fairfax County to aid in the budget and planning decision-making process. Such a system can result in meaningful decisions only if the basic principles of implementation are applied, i.e. the establishment of goals, objectives, and measures of effectiveness, data collection and recordation, and program evaluation. The establishment of goals, objectives, and measures of effectiveness are necessary to provide a means of evaluation through a comparison of an agency's activities in terms of present level of service to the agency's desired level of service - it's goal. The data collection function is necessary to provide the needed statistics which are compared and analyzed, and which leads to the final step - the evaluation. The evaluation process is accomplshed by measuring actual progress against the desired target or goal.

As noted previously, there exists in the data collection process inherent problems in obtaining and measuring data with regard to citizen satisfaction. Most of the data collected relates to numerical tabulations of "how many" and "how often," rather than a citizen's like or dislike of a given activity. To better gain a feel for the citizens' wants and needs, the county of Fairfax undertook a citizen attitude survey. The basic purposes of the survey was to determine the attitudes of the citizens with regard to specific public services provided by the County of Fairfax. The results of the survey clearly showed a 78 percent citizen satisfaction with the present level of service now provided, with 72 percent agreeing that the level presently expended in performing these services should remain the same.

The use of these types of surveys, along with the program evaluation technique presently undertaken allows Fairfax County to be among the top in the nation in its ability to meet the needs of the citizens in providing an efficient level of library services.

Prepared by: Sue Graff

Under the direction of: Sam Finz
Office of Research
Statistics
Fairfax County, Virginia

APPENDIX F

Supervisory Skills

May 7, 8, 10, 1976

OBJECTIVES

1. To increase library effectiveness through improved knowledge of techniques and theories of supervision by participating staff members.
2. To increase individual competencies in specific areas of supervision.
    a. Supervisory Styles
    b. Time management
    c. Decision-making
    d. Motivation
3. To disseminate information through participants to other library staff members (informal communications, workshop replication, etc.)
4. To promote interaction among librarians and between librarians and other professionals.

DISCUSSION/LECTURE TOPICS

Theories of management
Ways of influencing behavior
Keys to time management
Deterrents to good time management
The decision-making process
Theories of motivation
The role of the supervisor in motivating
Specific ways to motivate people
Job enrichment

MATERIALS

Films: Style of Leadership, Roundtable Films, 113 No. San Vincent Blvd, Beverly Hills, California

KITA, or What Have You Done for Me Lately, and Job Enrichment

MATERIALS (continued)

In Action, BMA Communications,
9401 Decoverly Hall Rd.,
Rockville, Maryland 20850

How to Get Control of Your Time and Your Life, Cally-Curtis Co.,
1111 No. Las Palmas, Hollywood,
Calif., 90038

Video tape of lecture available by contacting Library Planning Office Metropolitan Washington Council of Government, 1225 Connecticut Ave., Washington, D.C. 20036

Articles: "You can Lift Morale and Productivity" by James Owens. Reprinted from Supervisory Management, July 1974, pp. 30-38, Articles I

"One More Time, How do you Motivate Employees" by Frederick Herzberg, Reprinted from Harvard Business Review, January-February 1968, pp. 53-62

"How to Choose a Leadership Pattern' by Robert Tannenbaum and Warren H. Schmidt, Reprinted from Harvard Business Review, May-June 1973 pp. 162-171

Bibliography.
Pg. 172-174

MODE

Traditional workshop mode involving lectures, full and small group exercises, and informal discussion.

INSTRUCTORS

4 private consultants

Mr. Kent Baker
Associate Professor
School of Business Administration
American University
Washington, D.C. 20016
686-2411

INSTRUCTORS (continued)

Ms. Deloras Dunne
Staff Consultant
Concern Group, Incorporated
13003 Beechtree Lane
Bowie, Maryland 20715
262-4294

Mr. Chet Haskell
Director of Public Management Training
Center for Urban Ethnic Affairs
Catholic University
4408 8th Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C.
529-5400

Mr. Ernest Taylor
Staff Consultant
Concern Group, Incorporated
13003 Beechtree Lane
Bowie, Maryland 20715
26204294

PARTICIPANTS

7 academic librarians
11 public librarians
2 school librarians
7 special librarians

STRENGTHS

Quality of instruction
Appropriateness of content
Diversity of participants

WEAKNESSES

Attempt to cover too much in the time allotted.
Failure to include library related material

OUTCOMES

Replication of course on self-supporting basis

BIBLIOGRPAHY

SUPERVISION AND MOTIVATION

Beckhard, Richard, Organization Development: Strategies and Models (Reading, Mass. Addison-Wesley Publishing, 1969)

Bennis, Warren. Beyond Bureaucracy. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Bennis, Warren. Temporary Society (New York, Harper and Row, 1968).

Best, Fred, ed. The Future of Work. Englewood Cliff, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1973

Blake, Robert and Monton, Jane. The Managerial Grid. 1964

Boren, James, When In Doubt, Mumble.

Cleveland, Harlan. The Future Executive.

Drucker, Peter. The Age of Discontinuity. New York, Harper & Row, 1969.

Dvorin, Eugene and Robert Simmons. From Amoral to Humane Bureaucracy. San Francisco, Canfield Press, 1972.

Etzioni, Amitai. Modern Organization. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1964.

George, Claude S., Jr., The History of Management Thought (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1972)

Katz, Daniel and Robert Kahn. The Social Psychology of Organization. Wiley, 1956.

Leavitt, Harold. Managerial Psychology (2nd ed.) Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Likert, Rensis. New Patterns of Management. McGraw-Hill, 1961

Maslow, Abraham, Eupsychian Management: A Journal. (Homewood, Ill. Richard D. Irwin Inc. 1965)

Maslow, Abraham, Toward a Psychology of Being, (Princeton, N.J., Van Nostrand, 1962)

McGregor, The Human Side of Enterprise (New York, McGraw-Hill, 1960).

Sherman, Harvey, *It All Depends: A Pragmatic Approach to Organization*. University of Alabama Press, 1968.

Shull, Fremont, et al. *Organizational Decision Making*, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1970.

TIME MANAGEMENT

BOOKS

How to Get More Done In Less Time, Joseph D. Cooper, Doubleday and Company, Inc., Garden City, New York, 1962.

How to Get Control of Your Time and Your Life, Alan Lakein, Peter H. Wyden, Inc., New York, 1973.

The Management of Time, James T. McKay, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1959.

The Nine Master Keys of Management, Lester R. Bittell, McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1972.

The Time Trap, R. Alec Mackenzie, AMACOM, New York, 1972.

The Use of Time, Godfrey M. Lebhar, Chain Store Publishing Corp., New York, 1936.

Time: The Irretrievable Asset, Richard C. Anderson, and L. R. Dobyns, Correlan Publications, Los Gatos, California, 1973.

ARTICLES

Barrett, F. D., "Everyman's Guide to Time Management", *The Business Quarterly*, Spring 1973, pp. 72-78.

Barrett, F. D., "The Management of Time", *The Business Quarterly*, Spring, 1969, pp. 56-64.

Barrett, F. D., "Tips on Time Management", *The Business Quarterly*, Spring, 1974, pp. 70-75.

Bureau of Business Practice, "Developing a Sense of Priority", *Executive Action Series* #159, 1973, pp. 24-34.

Bureau of Business Practice, "On Time", *Executive Action Series* #171, 1974, pp. 4-19.

Bureau of Business Practice, "Solving Time Problems," *Executive Action Series #161*, 1973, pp. 15-31.

Gold, Rosaline, "Planning Your Time", *Today's Secretary*, November, 1972, p. 10.

Haywood, James D., "Manage Your Time by Managing Your Activities", *Supervisory Management*, May, 1974, pp. 2-8.

Hoskinson, Robert E. "Work Simplification for the Secretary", *The Secretary*, 1972. pp. 17-20.

Jones, Curtis H., "The Money Value of Time", *Harvard Business Review*, July-August, 1968, pp. 94-101.

Mackenzie, R. Alec, "Myths of Time Management", *The Business Quarterly*, Spring, 1974, pp. 39-43.

Mackenzie, R. Alec, "Toward a Personalized Time Management Strategy", *Management Review*, February, 1974, pp. 10-15.

Manning, Dr. Barbara J., "Time Management and Economic Research," *Performance*, pp. 8-10.

Oncken, William and Donald L. Wass, "Management Time: Who's Got the Monkey?", *Harvard Business Review*, November-December, 1974, pp. 75-80.

"Teaching Managers to do More in Less Time", *Business Week*, March 3, 1975, pp. 68-69.

"Weapons Against Time-Eaters", *Secretary*, October, 1974, pp.26-27.

Wilkinson, Roderick, "Six Tips on Investing Your Time", *Supervisory Management*, September, 1973, pp. 30-33.

DECISION-MAKING

Jessie Nirenberg. *Getting Through to People* Prentice Hall, Inc., (1963)

Thomas Gordon. *Parent Effectiveness Training* Peter H. Wyden, Inc., (1971)

Peter F. Drucker. *The Effective Executive* Harper & Row, (1967)

6/PPF

PERSONAL PURPOSES FORM

Continuing Education Workshop for Librarians

SUPERVISORY SKILLS

Please complete this form and bring it with you on the first day of the workshop.

1. Name:______________________________ Date:__________
(last) (first)

2. Age:__________ 3. Sex:________

4. Organization for which you work (include name of branch or school.

____

5. Job title and brief description of responsibilities. ______

____

____

____

6. Describe briefly how you found out about this workshop.

____

____

____

____

7. Participants vary in their purposes for attending the workshop. Describe briefly your major expectations regarding what you hope to gain from the workshop.

____

____

____

____

____

____

8. Did you take this course:

______for your own interest?

______as in-service training on your present job?

______as preparation for a future position?

9. In what ways do you hope the workshop will help you with your job responsibilities?

____

____

____

10. List any other courses that you have taken in the past that relate directly to the workshop topics.

____

____

____

____

11. Briefly describe any work experience that relates directly to the workshop topics.

____

____

____

____

____

SUPERVISOR'S EXPECTATION FORM

SUPERVISORY SKILLS

May 7, 8, 10

The staff member of your agency indicated below will be participating in the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments' Continuing Education Workshop on Supervisory Skills to be held May 7, 8, 10. As part of our evaluation process for the workshop, we are asking supervisors of participants to complete this questionnaire and return it by the date indicated below. This will give us an indication of what the institutions involved expect their employees to gain from the workshop. Follow-up questionnaires will be distributed to participants and supervisors one to two months after the workshop. Thank you for your cooperation. If you have any questions, please contact Mary Sage, 223-6800, ext. 320.

Name:________________ Deadline Date:________

Name of Participant:________________

1. In what specific ways do you hope the workshop will help the participant with his/her job responsibilities?

2. Will the participant be encouraged by your agency to disseminate knowledge and skills gained at the workshop to other staff members?

3. In what specific ways do you hope the participant's workshop involvement will benefit other staff members or your organization as a whole?

INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION

SUPERVISORY SKILLS

May 7, 8, 10, 1976

As part of our evaluation of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments' continuing education program we are asking that you fill out and return this questionnaire by the date indicated below. Your reactions will help us in assessing the effectiveness of this workshop and in structuring future courses. Thank you for your cooperation.

NAME:______________________________ DEADLINE DATE:____________

1. What were your expectations regarding the workshop? In what ways did the workshop meet or fail to meet those expectations?____________________________

2. In what ways, if any, has your knowledge and understanding of libraries been increased?

3. Please comment on the responsiveness of the participants (amount of discussion, group interaction, interest, enthusiasm, etc.).

4. What differences, if any, did you note between this group and others you have addressed with similar presentations?

5. Do you feel the topics of your presentation were applicable to the field of library science?

6. Are there alternative methods of presentation which you feel might have been more effective?

7. Were you adequately informed as to what was expected of you?

8. Do you have any comments or suggestions which might help us in planning and implementing future workshops?

9. Would you be willing to participate in similar workshops in the future?

10. Please recommend any other professionals in your field who might be interested in serving as instructors for future workshops. Indicate name, organizational affiliation, and area(s) of expertise.

End of Course Participant Questionnaire

SUPERVISORY SKILLS
May 7, 8, 10, 1976

As part of our effort to evaluate the effectiveness of this workshop we would appreciate your completing this questionnaire. It is important that every participant complete and return this form so that the reactions of the total group will be reflected.

We are asking you to indicate your name to facilitate coordination of returns. This questionnaire is completely confidential. Particular replies will be treated in summary form, and names will not be associated with specific replies.

NAME:____DEADLINE DATE:________

PART I - FORMAT

Please circle the most appropriate word(s) or phrase(s), fill in the blanks, and add explanatory comments where necessary or appropriate.

1. In general I feel there was (much -- some -- very little) interrelationship and (much -- some -- very little) continuity among the class sessions.
2. The class meeting time, 9:00 - 4:00, was (convenient -- inconvenient).
3. A better meeting time would be_________________________________.
4. Holding the workshop sessions on consecutive or near consecutive days was (convenient -- inconvenient).
5. A better schedule would be____________________________________.
6. Holding the workshop on a Saturday was (convenient -- inconvenient).
7. Please tell what you liked or disliked about the following aspects of the class format:

   Formal lecture____

   ____

   Informal discussion____

   ____

   Supplementary materials____________________________________

   ____

Participatory exercises ____________________

____

Variety of speakers ____________________

____

Other (please specify) ____________________

____

8. Are there any changes in format that you would recommend? ____

____

PART II - INSTRUCTIONS

In the area below you are requested to evaluate the instructors who have made presentations to this class. Please rate each of the speakers on the basis of presentation content (Was the material well prepared? Was substantial information conveyed? Did the material appear to be technically accurate? Was more than one point of view presented?); presentation delivery (Did the speaker present the material in an interesting fashion? Did he/she make use of visual aids? Was the material organized, understandable?); and audience contact (Was the presentation geared to this group? Did the speaker interact well with the class? Did he/she respond to questions well? Did he/she aid the group in interacting with each other?) Please add explanatory comments where necessary or appropriate.

SPEAKER

Chet Haskell (May 7)

Content: ____________________
Excellent Very Good Good Fair Poor

Delivery: ____________________
Excellent Very Good Good Fair Poor

Audience Contact : ____________________
Excellent Very Good Good Fair Poor

Comments ____________________

____

Ernest Taylor (May 8,morning)

Content: ____
Excellent   Very Good   Good   Fair   Poor

Delivery: ____
Excellent   Very Good   Good   Fair   Poor

Audience Contact: ____
Excellent   Very Good   Good   Fair   Poor

Comments: ____
____
____

Deloras Dunne (May 3, afternoon)

Content: ____
Excellent   Very Good   Good   Fair   Poor

Delivery: ____
Excellent   Very Good   Good   Fair   Poor

Audience Contact: ____
Excellent   Very Good   Good   Fair   Poor

Comments: ____
____
____

Kent Baker (May 10)

Content: ____
Excellent   Very Good   Good   Fair   Poor

Delivery: ____
Excellent   Very Good   Good   Fair   Poor

Audience Contact: ____
Excellent   Very Good   Good   Fair   Poor

Comments ____
____
____
____

PART III - CONTENT

Please circle the most appropriate word(s) or phrase(s), and add explanatory comments where appropriate or necessary.

1. This course has been (almost always -- frequently -- sometimes -- almost never) informative.

2. The materials and ideas discussed have been generally (too complicated -- understandable -- too simple).

3. The presentations have been (too theoretical -- too practical -- fairly balanced between theoretical and practical).

4. The information presented has been (very relevant -- fairly relevant -- not relevant) to my occupational needs.

5. Were there topics or aspects of topics that:

   (a) Did not need to be covered? Which ones?

   ____

   ____

   (b) Were covered insufficiently? Which ones?

   ____

   ____

   (c) Were not covered at all and should have been? Which ones?

   ____

   ____

6. In what ways have you gained a better understanding of:

   Supervisory styles

   ____

   ____

   Time management

   ____

   ____

   Decision-making

   ____

   ____

Motivation

____

____

PART IV - GENERAL

Please answer these questions in a few sentences, but be as specific as possible. If you need more space, write on the back of the sheet.

1. What did you expect from this course when you registered for it?

____

____

____

2. Did the course meet your expectations? Exceed your expectations? Disappoint you? How?

____

____

____

3. Have you ever attended a workshop on this topic given by librarians? If yes, was this workshop more effective or less effective than those you have previously attended? In what ways?

____

____

____

4. In what ways, if any, has the course provided you with any concrete information or skills that can be applied to your present job?

____

____

____

5. Did you get any useful information from other workshop participants?

____

____

6. If so, was this an important aspect of the workshop for you?

____

____

7. Do you have any suggestions for additional courses in areas not directly related to the library field which the Council of Governments might offer to meet your special needs or those of your library?

____

____

____

8. Please add any additional comments, criticisms, and suggestions you may have concerning course content, format, instructors, and your needs. Please include any suggestions you might have for improving this course in the future. (Use reverse side of this page if you need more room.)

____

____

____

____

____

9. Please indicate the name and business address of your immediate supervisor.

____

____

____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP

Follow-up Questionnaire - Participants

SUPERVISION SKILLS

May 7, 8, 10, 1976

As a recent participant in COG's Continuing Education Workshop on Planning and Budgeting, we are asking you to fill out this form and return it by the date indicated below in the enclosed envelope. This questionnaire will help us in determining what effects workshop attendance may have had on the individual participants and their library systems. Please answer questions as specifically as possible, giving examples where necessary or appropriate.

Again we are asking you to indicate your name to facilitate coordination of returns. The questionnaire is completely confidential, and names will bot be used in conjunction with specific replies. If there are any questions, please contact Mary Sage, 223-6800, ext. 320. Thank you for your cooperation.

NAME:______________________________ DEADLINE DATE:____________

1. In general, the objective of the workshop was to introduce participants to theories and techniques which will help them to deal more effectively with issues and problems in areas of supervision. To what extent was this objective accomplished for you by the workshop program.

   (5) Very well (4) Quite well (3) Somewhat (2) Hardly (1)Not at all

2. If, in general, you feel that the workshop objective was successfully achieved for you, indicate the one factor that contributed most to its success. Likewise, if you feel it was not successfully achieved for you, indicate the one factor that contributed most to its failure.

3. Please indicate ways in which you feel your participation in the workshop may have increased your competency as a librarian in specific areas of supervision.

4. Which parts of the course have been the most useful to you? Why?

5. Which have been the least useful? Why?

6. What effect, if any, do you feel your participation in the workshop has had in your library?

7. In what ways, if any, have you passed on information gained at the workshop to other library staff members (informal discussion, distributing handouts, conducting mini-workshops, etc.)?

8. In what ways, if any, has your participation in the workshop stimulated subsequent interaction between yourself and librarians in other systems or professionals in other disciplines? This interaction need not relate directly to the subject of the workshop.

9. Would you be interested in attending future courses offered by the Council of Governments?

10. Would you be able to participate if a fee ($50 approximately) were charged?

11. Please indicate any further comments or suggestions regarding the workshop.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP!

Follow-up Questionnaire - Supervisors

SUPERVISORY SKILLS

May 7, 8, 10, 1976

As part of our evaluation of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments' continuing education program for librarians we are requesting supervisors of workshop participants to complete this questionnaire. This is in no way an attempt to evaluate the performance of individual participants, but is, rather, designed to help us in determining the effects of workshop attendance upon the participants and their respective libraries. The questionnaire is completely confidential, and names will not be used in conjunction with specific replies. Please complete the form and return it by the date indicated below. Thank you for your cooperation. If there are any questions please contact Mary Sage, 223-6800, ext. 320.

NAME: ______________________________ DEADLINE DATE: ______________
(last) (first)

Name of Participant: ______________________________________

1. Please indicate what specific ways, if any, you feel workshop participation may have improved or otherwise affected the participant's competencies as a supervisor.

____
____
____
____
____
____
____

2. What specific effects, if any, has his/her participation in the workshop had in your library?

____
____
____
____
____
____

3. In what ways, if any, has the participant disseminated information or skills gained at the workshop to other staff members (informal discussion, distributing handouts, conducting mini-workshops, etc.)? Has this resulted in increased effectiveness by other staff members?

____

____

____

____

4. Do you feel the objectives of your organization in sending the participant to the workshop were met?

____

____

____

____

____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP!